FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 232 3 December 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Press Conference on Banning Nuclear Tests AA 1
[Vorontsov, Petrosyants, Nersesov, Pyadyshev]
Press Report on Conference AA 5
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 3 Dec]
Dadyants Views U.S. Retreat From Summit Accords AA 6
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 27 Nov]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Further Reportage on U.S. Iranian Arms Deals A 1
Senate Hearings Begin A 1
Carlucci Appointment Viewed [Turkatenko] A 1
Orlov Commentary A 2
Report Lists 'Watergate-Style Break-Ins' in U.S. [Knyazkov] A 3

SOUTH ASIA

Delhi TV Version of Gorbachev Interview D 1
Gorbachev, Gandhi Sign Delhi Declaration D 14
[PRAVDA 28 Nov]
IZVESTIYA Reports Gandhi USSR Embassy Speech [28 Nov] D 17
Gerasimov Evaluates Gorbachev India Visit D 18
Moscow TV Comments on Gorbachev Visit to India D 19
[Ovchinnikov]
DRA's Najibullah on Results of PDPA Plenum D 20

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Talyzin Receives SRV Leader Dong Si Nguyen E 1
Kurkotkin Visits SRV, Meets Van Tien Dung E 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Nov]

EASTERN EUROPE

TASS Reports Chebrikov Arrival in SFRY F 1
TRYBUNA LUDU Attacks Solidarity ICFTU Membership F 1
[TRUD 26 Nov]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Iranian Envoy Meets With Official in Baku 1 Dec H 1
[Tehran IRNA]
IZVESTIYA Hits Iranian Support for Afghan Rebels H 1
[Kozhevnikov 2 Dec]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

U.S. Maneuvers in Honduras 'Another Provocation' [Trushin] K 1
Castro Discusses Production Management, Payment K 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Menteshashvili Reports on Supreme Soviet Decrees [PRAVDA 20 Nov] R 1
Continued Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet R 2
Maslennikov Report R 2
State Plan, Budget Discussed R 3
Evening Session Ends R 4
Law Adopted R 4
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Holds Session 17 Nov [PRAVDA UKRAINY 28 Nov] R 5
Kunayev Attends Kazakh Supreme Soviet Session R 7
Cherkassy Obkom Investigates Railroad Accident [PRAVDA 2 Dec] R 7
New Editor Zalygin Outlines Plans for NOVYY MIR [Melikyants in IZVESTIYA 16 Nov] R 8
Vaccination Carried Out Against A-1 Flu Virus R 12

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Vorotnikov Attends Meeting of Kolkhoz Councils T 1
Murakhovskiy, ...konov Speak T 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Launch of Cosmos-1803 Earth Satellite Reported U 1
Marchuk Interviewed on New Science Departments [Savitskiy] U 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Moscow Meeting Marks Missile Troops Day [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Nov] V 1
Leaders at Commemoration of MSU Zhukov's Birth V 1

PRESS CONFERENCE ON BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS

LD022354 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2005 GMT 2 Dec 86

["Press Conference on Problems of Banning Nuclear Tests" at USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow on 2 December, with panelists Yuliy Mikhaylovich Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign affairs minister; Andranik Melkonovich Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy; and Igor Leonovich Nersesov, corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR; presented by B.N. Pyadyshev -- recorded]

[Text] [Pyadyshev] Esteemed comrades, ladies and gentlemen. Why is it that while Soviet test sites have been silent, since 6 August 1985, nuclear explosions have continued to thunder at the American test sites? Why is it that the latest round of talks between Soviet and U.S. delegations in Geneva ended without tangible results? Our press conference today is devoted to these problems. Taking part in it are Yuliy Mikhaylovich Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs; Andranik Melkonovich Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy; and Igor Leonovich Nersesov, corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, leader of the integrated experiment of Soviet and American scientists in Kazakhstan.

[Vorontsov] The total cessation of all nuclear tests -- we are still convinced of this -- is a major measure of prime importance, leading the fastest way to the curtailment of nuclear weapons and their subsequent elimination. So it is no accident that it became an integral part of the proposals that were proposed by the Soviet side at the meeting in Reykjavik. This conviction of ours was again confirmed in the Delhi Declaration signed during the recent visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to India, where, among specific and urgent measures directed at disarmament, a full ban on testing nuclear weapons was also clearly designated.

As is known, because of the attitude of the American side on the question of maintaining the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty provisions, in Reykjavik, unfortunately, it did not prove possible to reach final agreement on any of the directions discussed there. But both in matters of strategic offensive weapons, and on medium-range missiles, the sides were close to reaching mutual understanding also on the problem of testing.

President Reagan in particular expressed agreement with -- and I quote -- "the United States and the Soviet Union beginning talks, whose final aim is the complete cessation of nuclear tests." End quote.

However, on the question of tests, too, the American side is now disowning the Reykjavik accords, evidence of this being all the subsequent statements of administration representatives and also the third round of Soviet-American talks that has ended in Geneva. The American side even refuses to include the world "halt" in the name of these talks, proposing to discuss merely the tests themselves.

In what do we see the reason for such a stance? Above all, of course, not in the issue of monitoring [kontrol]. In the course of many years, perhaps even decades now, we have constantly been told: Once there is satisfactory monitoring [kontrol], there will be an agreement [soglasheniye] on the banning of tests. Even in Reykjavik, evidently through force of habit, President Reagan again spoke of the need for reliable monitoring. [kontrol].

But this was obviously said as a result of inertia. There is no longer any problem of monitoring the cessation of nuclear tests.

In our dealings with the current U.S. Administration, we have already been convinced on more than one occasion that when even its own position on this or that issue begins to hamper them, they change it as easily as people change their gloves. I suppose this has become their favorite trick in politics. One thing is said, but ultimately something entirely different is done. This is also relevant to the question of tests. When the argument about the inadequacy of monitoring [kontrol] collapsed, it became, I suppose, quite clear to everyone that the emperor has no clothes -- the United States simply doesn't want to end testing.

The reason for the American side's refusal to agree to the ending of tests lies in the fact that the United States is openly placing its stake on obtaining military superiority over the Soviet Union by means of the development [sozdaniye] of third-generation nuclear weapons. During the nuclear tests which are being carried out at the current time in the United States it is not just new nuclear warheads that are being developed [razrabatyvatsya], but space-based strike armaments that are also being developed [sozdavatsya] in accordance with SDI -- the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative.

[Vorontsov] Taking the arms race to new frontiers, Washington now says directly that until the time when nuclear arms are liquidated, nuclear blasts will have to thunder on earth. The fact that the problem of monitoring [kontrol] was only an excuse was confirmed once again by the Soviet-American talks, whose third round has only just ended. But Comrade Petrosyants will speak about this in more detail:

[Petrosyants] The Soviet Union has done everything it could in order tc move the problem of the complete ban on nuclear test away from a deadlock. Unfortunately, despite this the United States has not responded to the appeals to join in the moratorium, which we have announced and extended four times. But we do not intend to abandon the struggle for a complete halt to nuclear tests. We will, as before, vigorously strive for the achievement, together with all those who fight for the noble goal -- for a world free of nuclear arms and violence -- and for a complete halt to nuclear blasts on Earth.

[Pyadyshev] We already have a number of questions concerning the recent round of talks in Geneva. I will call upon Comrade Petrosyants now.

[Petrosyants] Thank you. [Word indistinct] a considerable number of various peace initiatives including those from 15 January 1986, and finally after the proposal of the Soviet side, this year, in 1986, in July 1986 the first consultations were held after a 6-year break, concerning the preparation linked with nuclear tests. There have already been three rounds this year -- in July, September, and November; it would seem that things are going briskly, but in fact we have not made any progress at all.

I would like to give you a few interesting facts: Here is an example: I will read the statement literally as a quote, not as my words but as a statement of the American side: the cessation of nuclear tests together with the liquidation of nuclear weapons is the final step and not the first step at talks on halting nuclear tests.

Turning your attention to this fact -- the cessation of nuclear tests is the final step and not the first step at the talks on ending the tests. Generally speaking, there is no logic in such a formulation of the question at all. It would seem that it is clear to every layman, not to mention a specialist, or any person, that if you halt tests you are already making the first step toward no further perfecting of nuclear weapons and furthermore, no further development [sozdavat] of lethal types of weapons, nuclear weapons.

It would seem that this is clear. However, unfortunately, in this context the American side poses the question exactly in this way and the so-called end goal is paramount here. And when we ask the question: What do you understand by the end goal, or, to be more precise, the long-term goal -- that is to say, the United States poses the question about the banning and halting nuclear arms tests as the long-term goal. I ask the question, a simple and natural one: What does it mean to say "long-term goal?" A year? Two years? Three years? How much time? The answer to this was forthcoming: This will only happen when the climate in the whole world is appropriate, when a situation arises in which there will be no need for nuclear arms. And, moreover, for as long as nuclear arms exist, the testing ought to continue, too. Here you have the American side's position. It is, of course, perfectly...does not make it possible to tackle the preparation of the treaty for real. [as heard]

[Pyadyshev] A question from the NOVOSTI press agency, to Igor Leonovich Nersesov, the head of the joint experiment of the Soviet and American scientists in Kazakhstan. In November this year, a group of Soviet scientists paid a visit to the United States. Can you tell us about the course and the results of this trip. What concrete accords have been reached with the American National Resources Defense Council [NRDC]. Please, Igor Leonovich, go ahead:

[Nersesov] This trip had been planned for the month of September, in connection with the fact that the main work on the joint experiment was already under way in the Soviet Union. We received permission only in November -- moreover, on these strange conditions: either we are the Council's private guest and we can stay in the United States for 1 week, visiting, strictly, only four places: San Diego, Dallas, Washington and New York, without the right to visit Nevada, that is to say, the facility that we would be coming to visit, or else we are taking part in the nuclear arms tests in the Nevada test range and then we are the guests of the U.S. Government. Well -- we rejected this latter option and we went as guests of the American NRDC. American specialists showed us samples of rock from eight localities in the region of Nevada, corresponding cartographic materials, geological maps and slides of the localities which had beforehand been selected by American seismologists, according to the geological data, as being suitable for work to be done there. On the basis of these materials we chose three localities, similar to those which exist in the Soviet Union, in Kazakhstan.

We agreed to establish on these sites now, directly, in the very near future, land-based seismological observation posts, without Soviet experts, since we have no permission to stay in Nevada. Furthermore, on these sites we plan, as in the Soviet Union, to drill 100-meter bores and step up new apparatus, until our partners in the council have a clear idea as to whether the American Government will give permission for bores to be drilled on these sites, given that all land in these sites is state property.

[Clark] Kate Clark, MORNING STAR, Great Britain. A lot has been written and shown on television here about the Soviet-American experiment in Semipalatinsk.

I would like to know whether, during your stay in the United States, the U.S. media also spoke a great deal about the initial stage of work by Soviet scientists in Nevada.

[Nersesov] Yes, our visit was reported in quite some detail by various newspapers during our stay in the United States; also at press conferences -- we took part in three press conferences. And, on the whole, the situation was pretty objectively described -- namely, the American Government does not permit us to carry out work in Nevada.

[Unidentified correspondent] Yuriy Mikhaylovich, quite recently U.S. Secretary of State Shultz said that the Soviet Union and the United States had come to an accord on the notes in respect of the issues of halting nuclear tests; now the issue to be discussed is what the melody is to be. How far does this correspond to reality; and if there is some sort of accord, what is the nature of this?

[Vorontsov] I think the secretary of state got a bit carried away with his metaphors. From the United States we hear but one melody, somewhat loud and in a low key -- the melody of nuclear explosions. As for accords, and those notes -- you have just been told how we tried to set to music everything positive that could be done at the negotiations in Geneva. But we did not manage to set it to music.

[Pyadyshev] Your question, please.

[Hardi] From here, if I may. Mihaly Hardi, Hungarian Television. Past week, the 131st strategic bomber came into armed service in the United States. After this, does not Soviet Union consider invalid all the existing limits of the SALT-II agreement, or will strategic parity be re-established on the part of the Soviet Union on a one-to-one basis?

[Vorontsov] On this account we at present have in front of us just a public statement from the Pentagon, plus some commentaries from individual U.S. officials. So far we have not received any official statement on this account addressed to us and there has not even been a public statement of that kind from the White House, from the President of the United States, or from the secretary of state. The Soviet Union is at present carefully studying the situation and I think that in time, once we also have in our hands the official reaction from the White House, we will be able to meet you once again and then talk specifically about all these issues.

[Unidentified correspondent] Soviet Television. Over the last few days in the United States there have been statements, in particular, for example, an expert such as Rowney recently made a statement that the closed nature of the Soviet society, as he put it, is an obstacle to monitoring [kontrol], how the Soviet Union observes agreements in the field of arms control. I would like to ask you to comment on these statements by the American side.

[Vorontsov] Evidently Mr Rowney is somewhat lagging behind the quickly-passing time. I do not know what closed Soviet society he finds at present, at a time when we propose that American scientists work on our nuclear testing grounds, at a time when we -- the Soviet Union -- have agreed to and have actively worked in Stockholm for on-site inspections [proverki] in necessary instances; when the Soviet Union is proposing the most extensive monitoring of reductions both in nuclear weapons and in conventional armaments in Europe. All this goes side by with our proposals, and numerous proposals at that, on these issues. Therefore, it would probably be better if people in the United States kept in step with the times rather than repeating fables from the past.

[Walker] Martin Walker, THE GUARDIAN. A question for Mr Vorontsov. The Soviet moratorium expires on 31 December. Has a decision already been made on extending once again the moratorium or is the Soviet Union going to resume nuclear tests next year?

[Pyadyshev] A similar question has been submitted here from Mr (?Nyudzume), from the Japanese newspaper ASAHI. Go ahead, please.

[Vorontsov] Indeed, our moratorium remains in force until 1 January next year. But there is still time, there is still time for the leadership of the United States to join in this moratorium, and then there will be no nuclear tests of any kind on both sides. I think that, of course, this is not much time, but it is enough for the United States to make an important political decision. And, even though the United States is so preocupied with other, sensational matters, I think it will not forget that our moratorium expires on 31 December and that it will make a decision of its own on whether to join the moratorium or not. And thus, the question of making a decision is, mainly, one for the United States leadership, and what follows will depend on this.

Press Report on Conference

PM022041 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 3 Dec 86 p 1

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center: Will There Be Silence in Nevada?"]

[Text] The complete cessation of all nuclear tests is a top-priority measure, the shortest way to the curtailment and subsequent elimination of nuclear weapons. It is no coincidence therefore that this measure was an organic part of the proposals submitted by the Soviet side at the meeting in Reykjavik.

This conviction was reaffirmed in the Delhi Declaration signed during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to India, Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, emphasized after opening a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists devoted to the problem of banning nuclear tests. It took place 2 December at the USSR Foreign Ministry's Press Center.

Unfortunately, because of the U.S. side's position in Reykjavik concerning the maintenance of the ABM Treaty, final accords could not be reached on any of the avenues discussed there, the speaker continued, but -- as on the questions of strategic offensive arms and medium-range missiles -- the side were close to reaching understanding on the test problem also. In particular President Reagan voiced assent to "the United States and the Soviet Union beginning talks whose ultimate aim is the complete cessation of nuclear tests."

However, on the issue of tests also the U.S. side is now disowning the Reykjavik accords.

The reason for the U.S. side's refusal to agree to end tests lies in the fact that the United States is openly aiming to secure military superiority over the USSR by creating [sozdaniye] third-generation nuclear weapons.

The press conference also heard a statement from A.M. Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy, who dwelt on the results of the third round of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on questions of halting nuclear tests.

As a result of persistent Soviet proposals, he said, the first consultatns for 6 years on questions connected with ending nuclear tests were held in July 1986. It was only after Reykjavik that the ice started to break to some extent. At the start of the third round in November the U.S. side reportedly that it had come not for meetings -- as it had previously insisted -- but for negotiations. This represented some movement forward. But in fact no headway was made.

The U.S. side proposed that secondary issues by resolved, in particular, the question of determining the yield of the nuclear explosions being carried out. For the Soviet side, which has declared a moratorium -- and a complete and unconditional moratorium at that -- this issue is of no great importance. But we were prepared to examine it if the U.S. side would say that it assesses this issue as a step toward a quest for ways to conclude a treaty or an agreement on ending nuclear weapons tests. Unfortunately, this did not happen.

The U.S. side declares: The ending of nuclear tests in parallel with the elimination of nuclear weapons is the final and not the first step at negotiations to end nuclear tests. There is no logic in this formulation of the issue.

Unfortunately, the U.S. side is talking of a "final" -- or, more precisely, "long-term -- goal. The question we pose is a simple and natural one. What does "long-term goal" mean? A year? Two years? Three? How many? Their answer to this: Only when the appropriate situation prevails throughout the world, only when the situation is such that nuclear weapons are unnecessary. Moreover, while nuclear weapons exist there must also be tests. This is the position of the U.S. side.

Then Yu.M. Vorontsov, A.M. Petrosyants, and I.L. Nersesov, corresponding member of the American SSR Academy of Sciences and leader of the comprehensive experiment in Kazakhstan by Soviet and U.S. scientists, replied to journalists' questions.

DADYANTS VIEWS U.S. RETREAT FROM SUMMIT ACCORDS

PM281215 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 27 Nov 86 p 3

[G. Dadyants: "Chances Since Reykjavik" -- first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] A great deal has been said and written about Reykjavik. But speculation continues in the West surrounding the Soviet proposals made at Reykjavik and the stand taken in this connection by the U.S. Administration. Is it now possible, when the U.S. side is clearly departing from the accords reached in the Icelandic capital, to accurately determine the significance of this meeting? Was it a success for the cause of peace or, conversely, did it signify a step backward -- for example in relation to the previous Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva?

This question is asked by many readers. Today, continuing our dialogue on the most important aspects of world politics, we return to the results of the meeting in Reykjavik between M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President R. Reagan and its consequences for the cause of peace and the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, as well as relations between East and West as a whole. G. Dadyants, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international correspondent, answers the questions of V. Golynnyy, designer and engineer at the "Lvovpribor" plant.

[Dadyants] The meeting itself in Reykjavik cannot be called a step backward -- it can and must be called a step forward. In Geneva, if you remember, an accord was reached that there must be no nuclear war and that there could be no winners in such a war. Both sides also agreed that they would not seek military superiority. The next step was taken in Reykjavik in the search for a solution to the nuclear disarmament problem. What is more, one can say that this was a turning point in the move toward a nuclear-free world.

In his statements on the results of this meeting, M.S. Gorbachev has provided detailed information and given our appraisal of the events in Reykjavik -- including in his recent interview with Indian journalists. I will only reiterate the main point: Practical accord was reached in the Icelandic capital on an initial 50-percent reduction followed by the total elimination of all Soviet and American offensive strategic weapons by 1996, and also on the total elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe and their reduction to 100 units per side in Asia. The far-reaching proposal put forward by the Soviet Union and approved by President R. Reagan opened up the real possibility of reaching agreement on these and other issues of such importance for the cause of peace and security on our planet.

Even G. Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, who has taken on the unpleasant task of revising the Reykjavik accords, was forced to admit, when addressing the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, that a qualitative change in the very nature of the discussion of disarmament problems had taken place at this meeting. "For the first time," he said, "in the long history of arms control talks, a real possibility emerged of making significant reductions in Soviet and American nuclear weapons." The actual agenda of the meeting and the very word "elimination" mean, to quote Shultz, "a stunning turnabout."

However, Reykjavik cannot be unequivocally evaluated as a success for the cause of peace. This is because, despite the fact that the sides were two steps away from reaching a historic accord, they nevertheless failed to do so. The problem of freeing mankind from nuclear weapons in the full sense of the word came up against the U.S. reluctance to abandon the idea of taking weapons into space. If one were to sum up Reykjavik in one sentence, one could say that it engendered great hopes -- because it showed that the maximum results can be achieved in the minimum time -- but, at the same time, it also caused great disappointment, because it fully highlighted the difficulties still blocking the way to nuclear disarmament. The attitutde taken by the American side since Reykjavik deepens this sense of disappointment still further.

[Golynnyy] Many of us are asking the question: Was President Reagan really sincere when he agreed in Reykjavik to these far-reaching Soviet proposals to eliminate nuclear weapons? Or was this simply a maneuver aimed at showing himself in the role of "peacemaker"?

[Dadyants] It seems to me that the question to be asked is not whether President Reagan is sincere or insincere, but whether the forces at present predominating in U.S. politics are those aspiring to confrontation with the USSR and to continuing the arms race or those trying to find a reasonable compromise and a means of reducing tension.

The fact that attempts were made immediately after Reykjavik to disavow what the President had said (they said he had supposedly been "wrongly interpreted," that the U.S. delegation had been in a state of "exhaustion and euphoria" and had consequently accepted the Soviet proposals without considering the "threat" they allegedly pose to U.S. security) shows that the military-industrial complex is adamantly opposed to the very possibility of an accord. [paragraph continues]

Vast resources are tied up in SDI, in particular, and the implementation of this program promises corporations in the military-industrial complex billions of dollars and, in the future, trillions of dollars in profits. They will not voluntarily give up these profits, of course.

The interpretation of the Reykjavik results being urgently circulated in the United States today is very interesting. It claims that the President consented only to the elimination of ballistics missiles and not to the elimination of all strategic weapons. It is this distorted version of the Reykjavik talks that G. Shultz conveyed in Vienna during his meeting with E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister. According to this version, strategic bombers and cruise missiles would remain. This interpretation or, to be more precise, distortion of the Reykavik accords not only has the aim of trying to ensure military superiority over the USSR -- it is also highly advantageous to the military-industrial complex. U.S. corporations have already made enough profit on ballistic missiles, but the profits are only just beginning to come in from cruise missiles, including those deployed on strategic bombers.

[Golynnyy] The U.S. side claims that an accord was not reached in Reykjavik because of the Soviet Union's uncompromising attitude regarding SDI. What is more, the matter is being presented in such a way as to make it seem that an accord is still possible -- the USSR only has to take another step toward the United States and drop its objections to SDI.

[Dadyants] In Reykjavik the Soviet Union moved to meet not only the United States but the West as a whole. For example, we gave up our objections to the improvement of British and French nuclear weapons while the USSR and the United States would be in the process of reducing and then eliminating their strategic weapons and medium-range missiles. We also made concessions with regard to SDI -- we agreed to a 10-year cycle of U.S. laboratory research on this program. It must be taken into account that 10 years is exactly the length of time in which the Soviet and U.S. strategic weapons would be totally eliminated. We proposed to President Reagan that after this period had expired talks be held to decide how to process further.

But Reagan insisted on the immediate U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty and the deployment of space weapons immediately after the expiration of this 10-year period. The USSR naturally could not contemplate this, as it would not only be a question of the fate of the termless ABM Treaty -- it would also mean giving the Americans unilateral military advantages over the Soviet Union. SDI is not a defensive program as the United States claims, it is an aggressive program to develop the most lethal weapons and, what is more, qualitatively new types of such weapons. Accepting U.S. demands under these conditions would mean jeopardizing the security of our country and of our allies.

It is, therefore, not a question of the Soviet Union taking an uncompromising attitude. Our partners in the talks proved unwilling in practice to conclude an agreement which envisaged equal security for both sides. The United States is still prey to the illusion of it being possible to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union.

[Golynnyy] Why are some West European countries so suspcious of the accord reached in Reykjavik to scrap the "Euromissiles"? They used to be in favor of R. Reagan's "zero option." Can one deduce from this that West European policy is evolving in the wrong direction?

[Dadyants] There are indeed forces in West Europe which, only yesteday, were strongly demanding the elimination of the Soviet SS-20 missiles, but now they do not want the U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles to be withdrawn from Europe. A member of M Thatcher's cabinet described the situation as follows: "Suddenly Europe has become attached to its arsenals."

Nevertheless, I would not say that West European policy is evolving in the wrong direction. Europe is still in the vanguard of the detente process. Evidence of this is provided by the accords reached in Stockholm, and the Vienna meeting now in progress. Europe is still capable of accelerating the course of events -- if it give up its old way of political thinking.

[Golynnyy] What, in the present conditions, when the Americans are renouncing the Reykjavik accords, are the prospects for further dialogue between the USSR and the United States? Will the earlier planned visit by M.S. Gorbachev to the United States still take place?

[Dadyants] Dialogue, of course, will continue. The situation in the world is so dangerous that no chance of agreement should be missed.

Of course, the time that has passed since Reykjavik has shown that the U.S. side is taking an unconstructive attitude. All the old garbage of the pre-Reykjavik U.S. proposals -- all the levels and sublevels, limits and sublimits -- which are intended to deadlock the talks has been brought up again in Geneva. Attempts are being made to take individual issues out of the general context -- for example, the idea of resolving the issue of medium-range missiles as something separate from the package of Soviet proposals. In other words, to accept the concessions contained in the package without accepting the package as a whole. The United States has declared a real war on all international treaties restraining the arms race, and especially the SALT II Treaty. In his recent speech at a center for research in the sphere of ethics and social policy Reagan once again tried to stir up a wave of anti-Sovietism in the United States and resorted to crude slander against the Soviet Union. All this is a manifestation of the bankrupt policy of acting from a position of strength.

The contemporary world is rapidly changing, however. It can no longer be what it was before Reykjavik. As B. Craxi, prime minister of Italy, rightly observed, it is now impossible to deviate from and disregard the fundamentals of accords which were so close to being reached and which must form the core of future talks.

This is basically the answer to your second question -- regarding the prospects for a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. No one has called it off [nikto yeye ne otmenyal], but it must be constructive and take into account the fact that going back on what was achieved in Reykjavik is unnacceptable and impermissible.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON U.S. IRANIAN ARMS DEALS

Senate Hearings Begin

LD022235 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The growing scandal over the secret deliveries of U.S. weapons to Iran and the handing over of the proceeds to anti-Nicarguan contras has turned into a crisis of confidence for the U.S. President. According to the results of a Harris Service public opinion poll that have been disseminated in New York, 54 per cent of those polled spoke of their mistrust of the President.

In the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, hearings have begun on the White House's secret deals with Iran. President Reagan's former National Security Adviser McFarlane and the recently sacked National Security Agency employee North, on whom they are now trying to heap the entire blame for the illegal operation, have been summoned to give evidence there.

THE NEW YORK TIMES notes that participants in the hearings have received the impression that the most high-ranking members of the Reagan Administration did know about the transfer of monies from the Iran deal to the rebels in Nicaragua. President Reagan continues stubbornly to deny that he knew about the contra financing through the supply of arms to Iran.

Carlucci Appointment Viewed

LD022104 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Washington December 2 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reporting:

Speaking on television today, U.S. President Ronald Reagan announced the appointment of Frank Carlucci, former deputy director of the CIA, and former deputy secretary of defense, as the presidential assistant for national security affairs.

He also gave the consent to the appointment of a special prosecutor to look into the spreading scandal over secret U.S. arms shipments to Iran and the use of the funds from those sales to buy arms for the Nicaraguan contras.

Having agreed to the appointment of a special prosecutor, the White House travelled from the premise that under the laws "amended" after the investigation of the Watergate affair that led to the resignation of President Nixon, a special prosecutor must conduct his inquiries behind closed doors and documents of his investigation cannot be published without the White House's consent.

In addition to that, the attorney general received the right to decide whether the findings of a special prosecutor merit further investigation.

This means that the current Attorney General Edwin Meese, who is President Reagan's close aide and personal friend, will have the possibility to control the actions of a special prosecutor and give them the final evaluation.

Commenting on the President's consent, the CNN television company recalled that six such prosecutors had been appointed in Washington since 1978 to look into unlawful actions in which high-ranking U.S. officials are involved so often.

However, the TV company said, the investigations had not produced any indictments or charges of law-breaking.

Orlov Commentary

LD021845 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS -- By TASS political news analyst Igor Orlov

The scandal that broke out around secret shipments of U.S. arms to Iran and the transfer of part of the receipts from the arms sales in aid to Nicaraguan contras -- just another unlawful operation -- shows no signs of subsiding. On the contrary, it is aggravating the atmosphere in Washington and revealing new facts of duplicity and unabashed misinformation in which the U.S. Administration was implicated.

In this connection, American observers are speaking of the acutest political crisis facing the administration over its six years in power.

Much is also said about feverish attempts at putting out the fire sparked off by the latest adventure.

There is also some speculation about who may become the next scapegoat following the resignation of Vice-Admiral John Poindexter, presidential assistant for national security affairs, and his aide Lt.-Col. Oliver North .

The latter, incidentally, is described as a person who has a wealth of experience in implementing dirty operations, including the invasion of Grenada and the air bombing of Libya.

Perhaps that's why President Ronald Reagan, speaking in an interview to TIME magazine, chose to hail him as a "national hero".

Let us note that it happened after the "hero", just as he was about to leave the staff of the U.S. National Security Council, tried to destroy the more compromising documents related to Irangate.

Praising North as a hero, the U.S. President shows definite consistency in evaluating the actions of those who are engaged in subversive and terrorist operations on a global scale.

Let us recall that addressing the ceremony of laying the foundation-stone for the new building of the U.S. intelligence department in 1984, the President said that the CIA and William Casey, its chief, were an inspiring example for fellow-Americans and the entire world.

But, then, Casey's services to the current administration should not be underestimated.

Suffice it to recall that the previous political scandal which went down in history under the name of "Reagangate" threw light on Casey's many-faceted activities back in 1980 when he had managed the election campaign of the current President. His name was closely linked with the disappearance of President Carter's confidential documents from the White House -- the documents which were used for the benefit of the Republican candidate during the election campaign. The scandal around that affair arose in 1983 after many facts of that unsavory operation had come to light. Analogies prompt themselves, because now, just like in 1983, Washington is using all kinds of manipulations to dampen the intensity of the current scandal.

Speaking of the faulty and illegal methods used by U.S. Administration officials during the operation that led to Irangate (and not this operation alone) we should not lose sight of the most important thing. These methods reflect the faulty nature of the neoglobalist and adventurist policy which Washington is pursuing with surprising consistency.

REPORT LISTS 'WATERGATE-STYLE BREAK-INS' IN U.S.

LD031200 Moscow TASS in English 1140 GMT 3 Dec 86

[Text] New York December 3 TASS -- TASS Correspondent Maksim Knyazkov reports: The 'heroes' of the famous 'Watergate scandal', who penetrated the headquarters of the U.S. Democratic Party in 1972 for the purpose of installing listening devices there, have got followers in the years of Ronald Reagan's Presidency.

A public organisation, the Center for Constitutional Rights, has said that over the past two years alone 'unidentifeid persons' secretly penetrated the headquarters of at least twenty-five political and public organisations which oppose the present administration's policy in Central America. Money and valuables remained intact but important documents, which could have been used to expose Washington's subversive activities against Nicaragua and other Central American countries, disappeared practically after each break-in.

The latest of Watergate-style break-ins occurred in Washington last Saturday at the headquarters of the International Centre for the Policy of Development. The centre is headed by Robert White, a prominent critic of the White House policy in Central America, former U.S. ambassador to El Salvador. The 'housebreakers' did not take anything but documents on the U.S. CIA's secret deliveries of arms to the anti-Nicaraguan contras. Mr White had been thoroughly gathering the documents over a period of many years. In particular, Jack Terrell, a spokesman of the center, said that materials on the flights of 'Southern Air Transport' planes to Central America disappeared. The air company had been specially set up by the CIA for the supply of U.S. arms to the contras.

Similar break-ins were suffered by other public organisations which stand for an end to the undeclared war against Nicaragua. In May, according to the center for constitutional rights, there was a break-in at the headquarters of the New York organisation the North American Congress for Latin America. The housebreakers looked the organisation's major documents through and, judging by everything, photographed them. In June the same happened to the Central American Organisation of New England. Seven such break-ins took place over the past two years in the Boston area alone.

DELHI TV VERSION OF GORBACHEV INTERVIEW

BK251647 Delhi Doordarshan Television Network in English 1620 GMT 23 Nov 86

[Interview with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev by Indian journalists Nagvi, Balu, Joglekar, and Avashti in the Kremlin on 23 November -- recorded; Gorbachev's answers in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] [Unidentified journalist] It is indeed a rare privilege for us, for Doordarshan, to be here in the office of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU in the Kremlin. I hope I have described it rightly that this is your office. Is this so? Because I was was told that we were going to meet in your study.

[Gorbachev] Well, this is so. This is a working study, working office. This is my working study whenever I am in the Kremlin. This is where I can be found.

[Unidentified journalist] But there are no books here.

[Gorbachev] I can show you I have many books right behind me. [Laughter]

[Unidentified journalist] What life do you ever get time to read light fiction sometime. [sentence as heard]

[Gorbachev] No, I have too little time for that frankly. But still I can read some.

[Unidentified journalist] Which is the last good novel that you read?

[Gorbachev] To tell you frankly, I would name the latest novel by our writer Azmatov. This a very interesting novel, and this novel has been printed in three literary magazines, although the title is rather somber. It is called "The Chopping Block," that is the block where people get their heads chopped off. It is a very interesting novel and it is devoted to the study of some eternal problems -- the fight between the good and the evil. And of course we will talk about this subject too with you. This is a very interesting novel, and this is a major novel in our literary scene I would say, although I am sure that many people would be discussing that novel for a long time to come.

I can tell you that before you come up with your questions on the subjects that you have just listed and, of course, I would be prepared to satisfy your curiosity to the extent of my possibilities, to satisfy your interest and through our views both concerning at the international affairs and also our latest views and assessments on this subject, our points of view, if one may say so, on the Soviet-Indian relations. But I think that I would be making a grave error or misstep if I didn't avail myself of this unique opportunity, I would say, when I see here in this audience the people from television, from radio, from the press of India, and the mass media of India is well represented today. And, of course, I cannot but avail myself of this opportunity and make a brief speech, address, to the Indian people even if you are not in agreement with me, then you would have a hard time telling something different to your people, you won't be able to explain yourself away if you tell something that would be different from what I am telling you now.

First I would like to say that I am awaiting my meeting with India with great interest. It will be my first visit to India. But perhaps that is not the special attitude toward India. In the Indian people we see our old friend and reliable partner. We are satisfied with how our relations are taking shape. I have already had occasion to say, and I wish to say yet again: Relations with India occupy a priority position in our foreign policy. I believe we can say that the foreign policy of the deep friendly feelings that our peoples have for the Indian people.

We, on the other hand, constantly sense in the policies of the Indian Government an aspiration to reflect to deep feelings toward our people that exist in Indian society, in the Indian people. In my opinion these are the most important and durable things for our relations: tradition, friendship, friendship of many years' standing, and cooperation, cooperation in bilateral affairs and in international affairs.

Finally, there is a legal basis for these relations such as the 1971 treaty. Today I would like to say something about the great importance for the development of these relations both in the past and at present -- and I hope this will also be so in the future -- of the constant, intensive and constructive political dialogue in progress between the leaders of our countries.

No doubt Lenin had in mind esteem for the Indian people when he valued highly and when he predicted with special insight India's role in international affairs. This Leninist thought provided fertile soil for our policy and practical actions toward India. Many generations of Soviet and Indian leaders did good work for us and you to be able today to see our relations in such a state.

I want to recall Jawaharlal Nehru. We deeply honor his memory and highly evaluate his contribution to the formation of our relations.

I think that today the Soviet leadership and the Indian leadership headed by Mr Rajiv Gandhi, they too understand the responsibility rests upon them for the continuation and for the expansion of those relations. And I also think that this would be not only the most vital interest of our two people but this would also be regarded as a major factor in world politics. The factor that [word indistinct] in favor of progressive, peace stance, humanistic stance in international politics. The very fact is that the Soviet Union and India, representing the world of socialism on the one hand and world of national liberation and the world of development [on the other], have been fruitfully cooperating for many years.

Thus, I am looking forward to my meeting with India. Now I would like to end my short address to Indian listeners, readers and television viewers by cordially greeting them on behalf of all the people of the Soviet Union, and by saying once again that I look forward to my meeting with India.

Now let us get down to work.

[Unidentified Indian journalist] Mr Gorbachev, we followed with great interest your itinerary from Geneva to Reykjavik. These are landmarks of a sort. How do you see the road ahead?

[Gorbachev] You have asked the most important question, about which we are all concerned. I think a year has passed since our meeting in Geneva. And indeed, we can now come up with the certain assessments and evaluations, also mindful of what was done in Reykjavik as a milestone and our efforts to find ways of improving the international situation [word indistinct] peace and cooperation and also mindful of the responsibility that rests on the Soviet Union and also rests on the United States of America. I am convinced now that Geneva was important. I think without Geneva, Reykjavik would not have been possible. This is the first point. I am now convinced that Geneva was very important. Geneva made it possible to restore the interrupted political dialogue between leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States. This alone is very important. When there is a dialogue, there is a better understanding of each other's position. When there is a dialogue, the search continues. In any case this is the first positive thing that can be attributed to Geneva.

There were important accords there. I am referring to the final document. In it it was said: Nuclear war is inadmissible, there can be no winners in it. This is a very important political statement. This is a reply to all those who dream or at least concede the possibility of small, limited, local nuclear wars. So, if the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States admit that nuclear war is inadmissible, this is a very important starting point for the formulation of a new policy that corresponds to the nuclear space age.

There was also another important statement there: Neither side would strive for military superiority. So, if one adheres to this accord, too, then in any case both sides have to think not how to achieve military superiority but how, on an equal basis, to deal with disarmament questions and then the problems of the elimination of nuclear arms. So we stress the importance of the Geneva talks and decided on the acceleration of those talks. We also touched on several other problems concerning bilateral relations and I think that Geneva is an important milestone in international affairs.

The Soviet leadership has been faithful to the obligations undertaken in Geneva.

I want to confirm this with same facts. It is important to say something about this, because they have not lost their significance to this day.

After Geneva we extended the moratorium. On 15 January we proposed to the whole world a broad program worked out for 15 years for a stage-by-stage reduction of nucler weapons and thereafter eliminating them by the year 2000. Apart from this, our proposals after Geneva contained very important ideas, in our view, on other issues of the struggle against the arms race as well. I am thinking of Stockholm: We put forward some very important and constructive proposals there. This made it possible to conclude this important forum successfully. We put forward major solutions which seriously moved things forward in preparations concerned with working out accords between the countries on banning and eliminating chemical weapons.

All this was after Geneva.

Finally, in summer of this year major proposals on reducing conventional arms and troops were submitted by us jointly with the other socialist countries, Even what I have cited is sufficient to confirm tht the Soviet leadership acted responsibly after Geneva. But as regards nuclear weapons and the reduction of the nuclear arms race there have been no real shifts. Basically, they have reached deadlock. But we have acted constructively and responsibly in this situation as well. Taking into account the situation that has arisen in Geneva -- the situation of dealock I'll say it again -- I suggested to the President that we meet without delay, leaving all other matters behind. What more important matters can there be, if what we are talking about is the fate of the world and the fare of human civilization!

It was essential to assess everything taking place in Geneva and to give these talks a new impetus in order to shift this whole process, the Geneva process from its standstill.

I must say -- we have evaluated this appropriately -- that President Reagan accepted the proposal. This, too, is important in its own right. We do not wish the Soviet Union alone to take the credit for everything. The meeting would not have taken place if there had not been the agreement and the desire for the meeting on the part of U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

After the end of the meeting in Reykjavik -- and you know how it ended -- at the press conference I said: For all the dramatic nature of this meeting, for all its dramatic outcome, this meeting led us into new areas of understanding of issues and, above all, it has shown in a real way that accords, even on these difficult issues are possible. I reaffirmed this now. This constitutes the most important significance of Reykjavik.

I regret that our partners are causing confusion and muddle in people's minds not only in the United States but throughout the world with respect to the results of Reykjavik. This disappoints me. But it appears that the President is not free in making his decisions, nor, indeed, is the present administration.

I said, and I want to repeat it: Let the United States have pause for thought; let it weigh everything; let it make a responsible decision.

All our proposals remain in force. But we want -- and here I want to answer the second part of your question -- as far as the result of Reykjavik are concerned we want to go further, forward. The opportunities for this exist, they have opened up, the whole world has seen this nad the world wants this. But we are being dragged backward. Dragged backward from Reykjavik. The U.S. Administration has even forgotten altogether what was discussed, or rather, gives the appearance that the discussion in Reykjavik was about something else.

But I have to say that in European countries also politicians have been discovered who have taken fright at such a speedy and powerful advance by the Soviet Union and the United States in the search for accords both on strategic missiles and on medium-range missiles. Now they again want to return to the whole thing that spoiled -- well, not spoiled, but at any rate rendered ineffective -- the Geneva talks. As wer understand it, our -- the Soviet Union's, the Soviet leadership's -- main task is to retain the entire positive aspect of Reykjavik, and to complete the building, the bricks, which were deposited in Reykjavik.

[Unidentified journalist] It is claimed in certain circles that SDI is of such great, such crucial significance for the development of American science and technology, that it simply will not be the subject of negotiations. This is not my opinion, but that is what they are asserting and thinking in some influential circles. What is your assessment of this?

[Gorbachev] In general, every new weapon to some extent advances technical equipment and technology. This is, of course, quite elementary. For example, look at the development of jet engine, of jet aircraft, it was a very major stage in the development of technology. Look at the development of radio electronics. This too was a stage in the development of some military weapons but at the same time it meant progress in technology. This, I believe, is elementary. But I want to pose the issue differently. Let us think of the cost which the United States and the world must pay for the technological achievements which the present administration is expecting to gain by opening up a new stage of the arms race in space and by setting out to create [sozdaniye] space weapons which could bring the world to the brink of unpredictable consequences.

Can you, representatives of India, really agree to this? Can Indian people agree with this? We know that they disagree with this possibility. We know the firm position of India as described recently by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. The Soviet Union too cannot accept this possibility. And I think that all right-thinking mankind cannot agree to such a price for the sake of the achievement by American industry and science of some technological heights.

Is it really impossible to attain these same technological and technical, scientific heights by carrying out a program of the peaceful harnessing of space? I am sure that this is entirely possible. Our latest experiment the Vega project related to the study of the Halley Comet and the planet Venus. I received our scientists here after the completion of their project and they told me what new frontiers in technology were reached by our science and our industry in the course of implementing that project and that experiment. New materials were developed. New achievements were made in radio electronics and electrical technology, in optics, in mathematics, in other fields. These are major achievements -- technical, technological, scientific achievements. That is what we propose, the Soviet Union, and we have put it forward at the United Nations. Let's do it; let's ensure a technological leap forward; let's ensure that we reach new technical and scientific frontiers through the peaceful mastery of space.

We are capable of making a competent judgement about all of this. To a certain extent we are on first-name terms with space; we have been working there for a long time now, and this includes cooperation between ourselves and India.

Well, if this is so, if it is possible to make technological achievements and to reach new frontiers in technology and technical equipment through the peaceful use of space and through mastering it upon a basis of international cooperation, then the question arises: Wherein, then, lies the real interest of the U.S. Administration in SDI, in the SDI project? Here it's not a question of technology at all. This is known by an enormous number of scientists both in the United States and throughout the world.

The U.S. Administration and the military-industrial circles of the United States once again want to overtake us, to break out, to achieve military superiority through space.

All those years that followed World War II America has been pursuing the objective of military superiority. It does not accept strategic parity, equal security. America would like to reach into space to achieve military superiority. As, I think Johnson once said: The nation that holds sway in space will hold sway on earth too. Politicians and representatives of the military-industrial complex are crazy about this. Herein lies the main question. This is something that we cannot agree to. Nor do I think that anyone can agree to it. If they try to present the SDI package in such a way as to make it appear that the United States will get the benefit here, that it will retain its technological and technical superiority over others, that this will bring benefit to the economy and ultimately to the people, then this is deception. In the years 1956-1976, as the Stockholm Peace Institute has indicated, the data from that institute [sentence as heard]. In those years the Government of the United States spent on research and development in the military area $264 billion. And the number of patents, licenses, received was 41,000. Private corporation in the same period in the civilian economy spent $176 billion. But the number patents they obtained was 897,000 for civilian purposes. SDI is a fraud. It is the attempt to deceive the American people -- all other people -- and some have been taken in by that deception. Some have fallen into the trap of that scheme. But it's not just deception but the main obstacle on the path toward those accords to which we were moving in Reykjavik. Now what could be the consequences of this Strategic Defense Initiative? This is indeed the crucial question, the question on whose solution really the further course of the negotiations on nuclear arms will depend, the further course of world development will depend. The question is whether the world is to enter a new stage in the arms race, through space, through SDI or the whole process of the arms race is stopped and the process of disarmament and eliminating nuclear weapons.

Thus, militarily SDI is a new stage in the arms race, it is moving on to new types of weapons, to space weapons. It is clear that this will not reduce international tension but will intensify it even more. To the Americans, they are trying to describe SDI as a kind of insurance policy, as something that will strengthen American security. But that is not true. This will not happen. Security will be diminished. It will be weakened, and this is understandable because the other side will be looking for countermeasures. It will find countermeasures, but that will mean a continuation of the arms race. Of course, in such conditions no reduction can take place. Politically, if the SDI program is implemented, then what sense is there at all in holding talks? Who will agree to easing the task of the military-industrial complex and the adventurists of militarism?

All this will make talks more complicated. SDI destabilizes the strategic situation and will not strengthen confidence, but rather will undermine it still further, will sow suspicions and uncertainty. It is a situation in which precipitate decisions may be made. The role of political leaders is very much in doubt when the arms race in space would be conducted. This is why both the Americans and the whole world community have to weigh everything about where SDI is pushing the world.

Finally, the economic aspect of SDI is of no small importance. SDI is a truly voracious being, a monster. According to U.S. data a minimum of $1 trillion will be spent on it, and according to other data something like $2 trillion. This will hit the United States; this will hit those countries which will be forced also to take part in this race. Ultimately, the problems and needs of the developing world will remain all the same. These are crying needs. It seems to me that the American people themselves, the Soviet people and the world community should reject this plan.

We are not afraid of SDI. We have considered what we have to do if the Americans continue with SDI. But this will not be our choice. The United States is pushing the world towards unpredictable consequences. The world should know this.

We greatly value India's stance. I have to say that the voice of peace-loving India in these last months of the acute struggle for where the world will go is a factor of enormous significance and is something of great value.

We know and value the position of the "Delhi Six." Incidentally, I want to say that we have received all their addresses and have given a reply to them. The Soviet Union shares the alarm of India, of all the "Delhi Six," and is willing to work together in the search for solutions to these urgent problems.

[Unidentified journalist] In your television statement of 22 October and in Mr Shevardnadze's recent statements there was a note of hope -- and optimism despite the U.S. Administration's attempts to depart from Reykjavik and to cause confusion, and despite the complicated situation. But I would say that your tone today was somewhat more disappointed. Am I correct? Today you are angrier, more indignant than even quite recently.

[Gorbachev] By my tone I wanted to convey my alarm. My standpoint remains the same. Like all my colleagues in the Soviet leadership, I am very concerned that the real results of Reykjavik should not in fact be drowned in a flood of all kinds of minor debates of little significance which have the aim not of leading this process on to a direct route toward a better world but of muddling the minds of the world public and of diminishing the results of the meeting. It is this disquiet that determines my tone. But we are incorrigible optimists. We are dedicated to the peace-loving line and will do a great deal more in order for this process to be preserved and to promote it. However, as they say, a bridge has to be built from both sides.

[Unidentified journalist] You speak of the need for new thinking and for fresh approaches in international politics. We study these statements of yours with great interest. For instance, your speech in Vladivostok. How is this manifested in the USSR's policies in Asia?

[Gorbachev] An interesting question, an important one of great significance. Our new thinking as we understand it, is based on the realities of the present age. We are all in the same boat. The nuclear space age has faced all of us, not just some individual countries, with the problem of the preservation and the survival of mankind.

This is our common problem. In connection with this, in our foreign policy we appeal to the whole international community. This is our common task: to protect human civilization from nuclear catastrophe.

Or take ecological problems. They have now assumed their full significance. These are also problems that can be solved only on the basis of the cooperation of all countries. The problems of poverty, underdevelopment, backwardness, moreover, affect whole continents of the earth. They cannot remain ignored and unsolved. So, it appears that although all of us are different, although all of us have their own convictions, their own ideologies, all of us recognize different political systems, have varied religious convictions, but still all these being so all of us are very much dependent on each other today. So today our thinking should be different.

We should work actively to find new approaches in building international relations. This is crucial. I think that without the active participation in the process of construction of new international relations and by the peoples and countries of such a vast continent as Asia, this is unrealistic. For Asia consists of India, China and the Soviet Union and billions of people, many peoples and states.

Incidentally, after exchanging opinions with Mr Rajiv Ghandi, with whom I have talked on these themes on two occasions, it seems to me that between us there is this understanding: that however difficult this process is in Asia, and it is certainly not easy -- nothing must be oversimplified. One must not imagine it is an easy stroll. It is necessary to develop on this continent the search for new solutions along the whole front. We tried to express our own ideas about this in the Vladivostok speech. We are now intensifying political dialogue with a large number of countries of the Asiatic region. Of course, we count on the great contribution of India and also on cooperation with it in these matters. We are conveying our ideas concerning the Asian process also to China, and we have a dialogue with small and medium-sized states.

We recognize the right of all countries to an independent choice, to determine their fate, political system and state structure. This has to be the starting point. And in this respect we reject every attempted interference in the life of the countries, in the processes that are taking place in those countries. Some countries have long ago embarked on the road of progressive changes and continue along that road, and this is their right. Others are just beginning to move along that road and we know that this is very difficult because this involves interference from the outsides, also internal struggle. We support the right of the people to solve for themselves their own national problems and no one can deny this right to any nation or any country. And we strive to see that our foreign policy in the Asian region is built on these principles. At the moment we are taking steps to increase and expand economic cooperation and cultural ties, to make them dynamic. I think we have expanded relations and our ties with many states both in the Pacific and in the Asian region. Of course, there are regional problems. We want a political solution and settlement to be found for them. On the whole, in my opinion, this will be a very difficult and long progress, but it is necessary. And I want to tell you once again that the way things would start moving in Asia will depend to a large extent on the overall direction international development would start moving. And I think that in Delhi we could have far more detailed discussions on [word indistinct] once we have an exchange of views with the prime minister.

[Unidentified journalist] Mr General Secretary, we are conducting this interview with you on the eve of your visit to Delhi. Could you now dwell on Indian-Soviet relations? How would you evaluate Indian-Soviet relations and their development since the time of Jawahalal Nehru? How do they affect world politics in the present-day situation?

[Gorbachev] To some extent I have already touched on this question in the beginning of my message to the Indian people. But I am ready to add to what has already been said: It is a subject which constantly preoccupies us and which is at the focus of our foreign policy activity.

Actually, relations between the Soviet Union and India are of immense value in themselves, not only for our two peoples, but for the whole world as well. I have said that we are pleased with these relations. In fact, we have a very active political dialogue that is very rich in content, in the spirit of deep mutual understanding. This has been characteristic of the whole period beginning with Jawahalal Nehru. I am very pleased that such an active dialogue, rich in content, is continuing at the moment between the present leaders of the Soviet Union and India.

I think that we have reason for saying today that our cooperation in the sphere of economics and trade is also an important sphere of Soviet-Indian relations. At the moment I don't want to go into figures and specifics. But over all these years following the declaration of India's independence we have been cooperating, and cooperating fruitfully, in the sphere of economics. Dozens of enterprises are living monuments to this cooperation and the best argument in favor of its effectiveness. Thanks to them, India is today resolving many tasks facing the country. Prospects are now opening up for cooperation in the power-engineering sphere. And I also view this as a factor which could be very highly (?effective) in the most strict sense of this word. We also have prospects of emphasis for cooperation in the area of most advanced industrial development. Major programs in the sphere of information and computer technology and machine-building are being implemented in the USSR. This will also expand opportunities for cooperation with India. Yes, we will also decide a thing or two in this respect during my visit. I shall not divulge anything now for the time being.

We have always treated with great respect the struggle of the Indian people for their self-rule and independence, have supported their peace-loving policy and have always shared their cares for the strengthening of the defense capability of your country.

Our scientific and technological links, cultural contacts and tourism are developing widely. This brings people together and gives them broad opportunity to pool experience and share their cultures.

Certain problems have arisen in trade turnover and trade, but now both the Soviet and Indian sides are acting constructively and the trade turnover will increase. And this is a subject that we are going to discuss further at a greater detail in Delhi. New prospects are arising now for introducing new forms of economic cooperation.

I think our cooperation, and Soviet-Indian relations in general, have a good future. For us there is no question of how to build relations with India. We see India as our great friend, and we value its enormous contribution to the world process in all spheres. And we are prepared to continue to actively cooperate with your country.

[Unidentified journalist] Mr General Secretary, I should like to dwell on the Soviet-Indian Friendship Treaty, which was signed 15 years ago. Do you view this treaty as important in the light of the present-day international situation?

[Gorbachev] Yes, I think this treaty and its significance extend beynd the bounds of Soviet-Indian relations.

Of course, when we signed the treaty of friendship with your country we were thinking primarily of the interests of the Soviet Union and India. That is quite understandable. But at the same time, the development of cooperation on the basis of this treaty and the boundaries we have reached during implementation of the provisions of this important document give us the possibility to say today that these relations -- and that means the Soviet-Indian cooperation treaty itself -- are a good example for other countries. Now, when we are talking about the search for ways to improve the international situation, and about the strengthening of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, such an example of cooperation, such an example of relations between states is a great asset common to all mankind.

We have been cooperating very fruitfully for so many years, and neither have we lost our independence because of this cooperation, nor has India lost or given up any of its independence in any way. But we have gained a lot. The most important thing is that our relations have become a powerful factor of international politics.

The treaty: this is not history, this is also the present day, this is the living practice of our days, of our time. This is how I would describe the situation in reply to your question.

[Unidentified journalist] You have spoken of Soviet-Indian relations. But I would like to know what you propose to offer for closer economic and scientific cooperation between our two countries?

[Gorbachev] Let you and me reserve this question for Delhi. When we have discussed everything with Mr Gandhi we shall come and tell you what we have agreed, what to do next. We shall not anticipate our talks. It will be all the more interesting for you if both sides state simultaneously what we have agreed on. I hope you will be at the press conference, and let us agree here with you that you will pose this question.

[Unidentified journalist] At the 27th CPSU Congress you spoke of the intention of the Soviet to leave Afghanistan. Then in Vladivostok you announced the withdrawal of a certain part of the Soviet troops. How do you see the situation in Afghanistan at this moment in time?

[Gorbachev] I shall immediately say that we have always had good and friendly relations with Afghanistan under all regimes and under all governments. These are being maintained now, too.

There are two points of principle from the basis of our attitude toward Afghanistan now as in the past: This is a neighboring country with which we have 2,500 kms of common border. Of course, one must always live on good terms with one's neighbors. That is elementary. Second, these people, implementing their own choice, have embarked on the path of reform. They have the right to do this. Neither you nor we can refuse them that. Otherwise, we would call in question, would have to call in question, the outcome of the fight of the Indian people before its independence and would have to call in question the outcome of the October Revolution in our country. We regard this as our fundamental principles. We do not make a secret of those principles. We are talking quite frankly about those principles. We have no bases in Afghanistan. We have no mineral deposits that we are exploiting there or sources of raw materials [words indistinct]. We have a long, big history of good neighborly relations with that country, and under the kings and the former governments too we maintained normal relations with that country.

I see no reason to change our attitude toward Afghanista, when it has taken the path of reform. Events there are not developing simply. Both we and you know the reasons, I think. And we had a very (?active) exchange of views with Mrs Indira Gandhi and her government and with the present Indian Government headed by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. We responded to a call for help, and on a temporary basis upon a request of the government, we sent our troops there. So that to some extent it will be in a position to a response to a call for help coming from a people which is friendly to us. As I see it, they have a very difficult struggle ahead, very long road to cover ahead before they are able to take the country on the road of contemporary development. We understand the problems that the Afghan people are faced with. I think that the Afghan people could have a found a way of solving national problems in a much more easier way if it were not for outside interference. And in that situation we responded to a call for help. But, of course, we have no intention to stay there forever. And I don't think that the Afghan people or the Afghan Government would accept that either. At present the current regime is doing a lot to broaden the social basis in society. It is proceeding now with serious agrarian reforms. It is now addressing its cultural problems. That is, as we see it, the current regime is acting to meet the interests of the toiling masses, the people. And this is not bad. But some find this not to their liking.

We are in favor of a political settlement surrounding Afghanistan. The Afghan Government is similarly disposed. It keeps up contacts with us and exchanges opinions. What is being done under the UN aegis -- I have in mind the mission of UN Under Secretary General Cordovez -- is a realistic process. It can come to a successful conclusion and result in a political settlement, if, of course, both Pakistan and the United States are in favor of a political settlement. As soon as some progress takes place in a settlement, immediately measures are taken by them to frustrate it. Nevertheless I think that the day is not far off when the question of a political settlement of the situation surrounding Afghanistan will be solved. This will also mean, at the same time, a solution of the question of the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan.

We are in favor of a nonaligned, independent Afghanistan. I want to say once again: We have no expansionist designs with regard to Afghanistan. This must be absolutely clear to the whole world. I hope that both the Indian Government and the Indian people have an understanding of our position recording Afghanistan, both today and in the future.

[Unidentified journalist] Tremendous interest is now being displayed throughout the world in the changes which you are carrying out in the Soviet Union. In a number of statements you have described these changes as being tantamount to revolution. Do you think you could go into more detail on this?

As a rider to this fairly broad question, I should like to say the following: Yesterday I learned that the Supreme Soviet has adopted a law on individual labor activity. On what level does your current economic policy differ from the new economic policy conducted by Lenin? To what degree do you derive a model from it?

[Gorbachev] Socialism brought our country up to a level at which it now is. This is a modern country, which has solved many questions on the basis of socialist transformations, a country possessing tremendous potential to continue successfully its progress, to develop its economy, to solve social questions and questions on relations between nationalities, to have a reliable defense and make a contribution to the building of international relations.

We are content with our territory. It is sufficient for us, although we have none to spare either. We have a very united people, with a very developed sense of patriotism and pride, because what has been done in the country today has been done by the people. When Lenin made the October Revolution a lot of vicious words were heard in the world. How are general laborers and women from the kitchen -- how can they govern the country, some asked. It turned out that they can govern the country.

But we are dissatisfied with what we have. Primarily because we can do more. Why? We have created a mighty economic potential. We have a mighty science, perhaps the mightiest in the world.

I have no wish to boast, but that is not even my view but that which prevails in the world. We have a good cadre potential. We believe that a new major set, a leap forward, might be taken through the use of these possibilities and the possibilities of the socialist planned economy, which provides enough room for implementing the necessary maneuver in the interests of structural policy and scientific and technical progress, in determining the right porportions and priorities, in developing the social sphere of the society, that is, by using the socialist system. I think that we became a little too relaxed. Elements of complacency and inertia emerged.

Indeed, socialism guarantees the right to work. So everyone has work in the Soviet Union. We have had success, although we have had also some difficulties in tackling the housing problem, in tackling other problems as public health and the (?education), problems of social insurance, social welfare. That makes our people confident of today and of their future. But the continuation of those positive qualities of our society is the fact that sometimes we see the elements of complacency.

We assessed it all at our congress. That was the right thing to do. Dissatisfaction with what we have, with the way our economy, our political institution and socialist democracy functioned, dissatisfaction with the atmosphere in collectives, were already felt in society itself.

Our main idea is through scientific and technical progress, in association with planned economy, and through democratization of society, to set it in motion, to ensure that society reaches new frontiers.

Very serious programs in the sphere of scientific-technical progress have already been compiled and are being implemented in our country. They embrace all industries. We give priority to engineering and computer technology and are changing structure policy. But the way we include man, the working man, in this process will be of crucial importance for the fate of our plans and of our policy; that is the main thing. In the economic structure we want to do this through financial autonomy, through the self-management of production collectives, through extending the selection of leading cadres by means of elections, and through the new economic mechanism. A new law about the enterprise is nearing completion. We will submit it to nationwide discussion. The way the economy is to function in the present conditions will be laid down in it. The main direction here is the democratization of production life, the greater independence of labor collectives and their greater responsibility.

This approach is being welcomed by the Soviet people. The process is already under way.

Furthermore, we want the political system, including the organs of local soviet power, social organizations, the trade unions, the Komosoml, women's organizations and others to function more effectively.

We are also thinking of putting the human factor into operation by means of greatly altering social policy in the interests of the working people. I would say that now the strengthening of social policy is now for us the key to solving many issues in society.

I must say that restructuring is not progressing smoothly. The most important obstacle is in [people's] thinking. What is needed is the restructuring of a mentality that has taken whole years to take shape. We are creating such economic, social, political and ideological preconditions that enables us to hope that here the process will prevail in the final analysis. We will ensure the restructuring of all spheres of society.

We attach considerable importance to questions of improving the intellectual sphere, cultural sphere and the moral atmosphere in the society. Our people have a very strong sense of justice and feel strongly about the consistent observation of the values of socialism.

This is why we are waging an uncompromising struggle against all kinds of negative phenomena, against abuses by officials, against criminal phenomena, immoral conduct, and particularly against the violation of discipline, order, and against phenomena such as hard drinking.

All society is taking an active part in this. That which is new is waging a struggle against that which is old. It is taking place under the party's leadership. The work within the party itself is being perfected and restructured. Moreover, we pose the issue as follows: The entire restructuring and all processes in society have to start from the party. We now make much greater demands on Communists. Some have been satisfied with the situation as it was in the country, satisfied primarily with their position. Now we remind everyone about their duty to the people. This is immensely important. The restructuring will need time and efforts. But I can say today very confidently that we have taken the right road. We are being supported increasingly by the people, and this process will be logically completed. This will enable us to move forward our entire society to be perfected qualitatively in the economic area, in the social sphere, in the spiritual sphere, and in terms of our moral atmosphere, and this is evident even now.

All that serves socialism we welcome, and we create prerequisites for the utilization of all the possibilities embodied in our system. We will also utilize more effectively all instruments of the planned economy, material stimuli and social factors and possibilities linked with the perfection of commodity-money relations. It is in this context that we adopted a law on individual labor activity. All this is in the framework of socialism. We shall go along this road. We do not waver. I think this will have vast consequences not only for our country but, taking into account its role in the world, for the whole world as well. It is natural that when we are putting forward and implementing such plans, we are interested in peace. We are also interested in cooperation, in cooperating with socialist countries, with the developing countries, with the capitalist countries. We are open for cooperation with all of them. [Addressing a journalist] You have a question I understand.

[Unidentified journalist] Yes, I should like to ask a question about a very important region -- the Near East. Have you any new peace initiatives for this region?

[Gorbachev] I think that the Near East is a common concern of the whole world. I want to emphasize that: a common concern. In my opinion, there has been no progress here for the reason that certain states have sought to settle the Near East situation in their own way. We now see that the policy of all kinds of roundabout maneuvers and separate deals has led to nothing good.

I think that there is now a growing understanding among the international community that it is necessary to bring this process on to an international level. I would stress the constructive nature of our proposal about the need to start preparatory work through the Security Council and through the preparatory committee with the aim of convening an international conference on the Near East. I believe there is a greater understanding now of the reality and effectiveness of such a course. I think that the preparatory stage for such a conference would make it possible to resolve many problems on the basis of bilateral contacts and exchanges, multilateral exchanges to develop serious proposals, substantial proposals, that will be in the interests of all peoples of this important and explosive region.

[Unidentified journalist] Sir, we have taken so much of your time. We have taken a great deal of your time and, in fact, I would like to extract from you a promise that your bureaucrats will let us meet you again because we had promised them that we shall confine the conversation to 1 hour and we have doubled the quota.

[Gorbachev] Yes, this kind of doubling the quota is good.

[Unidentified journalist] Sir, I hope that it will be the beginning of a process. This is a beginning of your equation with the Indian media [as received] and we shall have other opportunities, and I promise the officials that I shall keep it shorter.

[Gorbachev] I am glad we met and that I have had the chance to share my thoughts with the Indian public in answering your questions. I believe this is a useful -- shall we say -- exercise on the eve of my visit to India. So, until we meet in Delhi. Thank you.

GORBACHEV, GANDHI SIGN DELHI DECLARATION

PM031129 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 86 First Edition p 1

["Delhi Declaration on the Principles of a Nuclear-Free and Nonviolent World" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Today humanity stands at a crucial turning point in history. Nuclear weapons threaten to annihilate not only all that man has created through the ages, but man himself and even life on earth. In the nuclear age, humanity must evolve a new political thinking, a new concept of the world that would provide credible guarantees for humanity's survival. People want to live in a safer and a more just world. Humanity deserves a better fate than being a hostage to nuclear terror and despair. It is necessary to change the existing world situation and to build a nuclear-weapon free world, free of violence and hatred, fear and suspicion.

The world we have inherited belongs to present and future generations and this demands that primacy be given to universally accepted human values. The right of every nation and every person to life, freedom, peace and the pursuit of happiness must be recognized. The use of threat of use of force must be abandoned. The right of every people to make their own social, political and ideological choices must be respected. Policies that seek to establish the domination by some over others must be renounced. The expansion of nuclear arsenals and the development of space weapons undermine the universally accepted conviction that a nuclear war should never be fought and can never be won.

On behalf of the more than one billion men, women and children of our two friendly countries who account for one-fifth of mankind, we call upon the peoples and leaders of all countries to take urgent action that would lead to a world free of weapons of mass destruction, a world without war.

Conscious of our common responsibility for the destinies of our two nations and of mankind, we hereby set forth the following principles for building a nuclear-weapon free and nonviolent world.

1. Peaceful coexistence must become the universal norm of international relations:

In the nuclear age it is necessary that international relations are restructured so that confrontation is replaced by cooperation, and conflict situations resolved through peaceful political means, not through military means.

2. Human life must be recognized as the supreme value:

It is only man's creative genius that makes progress and development of civilization possible in a peaceful environment.

3. Nonviolence should be the basis of community life:

Philosophies and policies based on violence and intimidation, inequality and oppression, and discrimination on the basis of race, religion or color, are immoral and impermissible. They spread intolerance, destroy man's noble aspirations, and negate all human values.

4. Mutual understanding and trust must replace fear and suspicion:

Mistrust, fear and suspicion between nations and peoples distort perceptions of the real world. They engender tensions and, in the final analysis, harm the entire international community.

5. The right of every state to political and economic independence must be recognized and respected:

A new world order must be built to ensure economic justice and equal political security for all nations. An end to the arms race is an essential prerequisite for the establishment of such an order.

6. Resources being spent on armaments must be channelled towards social and economic development:

Only disarmament can release the enormous additional resources needed for combatting economic backwardness and poverty.

7. Conditions must be guaranteed for the individual's harmonious development:

All nations must work together to solve urgent humanitarian problems and cooperate in the areas of culture, the arts, science, education and medicine for the all-round development of the individual. A world without nuclear weapons and violence would open up vast opportunities for this.

8. Mankind's material and intellectual potential must be used to solve global problems:

Solutions must be found to global problems such as shortage of food, the growth of populations, illiteracy and environmental degradation through the efficient and appropriate uses of the resources of the earth. The world's oceans, the ocean floor as well as outer space are the common heritage of mankind. A termination of the arms race would create better conditions for this purpose [solving global problems].

9. The "balance of terror" must give way to comprehensive international security:

The world is one and its security is indivisible. East and west, north and south regardless of social systems, ideologies, religion or race must join together in a common commitment to disarmament and development.

International security can be guaranteed through the adoption of integrated measures in the field of nuclear disarmament using all available and agreed measures of verification, and confidence building; just political settlement of regional conflicts, through peaceful negotiations; and cooperation in the political, economic and humanitarian spheres.

10. A nuclear-weapon free and non-violent world requires specific and immediate action for disarmament:

It can be achieved through agreements on:

-- Complete destruction of nuclear arsenals before the end of this century;
-- Barring of all weapons from outer space, which is the common heritage of mankind;
-- Banning of all nuclear weapons test;
-- Prohibition of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction;
-- Banning of chemical weapons and destruction of their stockpiles;
-- Reducing the levels of conventional arms and armed forces.

Pending the elimination of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union and India propose that an international convention banning the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should be concluded immediately. This would constitute a major concrete step towards complete nuclear disarmament.

Building a nuclear-weapon free and non-violent world requires revolutionary transformation of outlook and the education of people and nations for peace, mutual respect and tolerance. The propaganda of war, hatred, and violence should be forbidden and the stereotyped perception of other nations and peoples as enemies should be discarded.

Wisdom lies in preventing the accumulation and aggravation of global problems which, if not solved today require even greater sacrifices tomorrow.

The danger that threatens manking is grave. But mankind has the power to prevent a catastrophe, and to pave the way to a nuclear-weapon free civilization. The gathering strength of the coalition for peace embracing the efforts of the Nonaligned Movement, the Group of Six countries and all peace-loving countries, political parties and public organisations gives us reason for hope, and optimism. The time for decisive and urgent action is now.

[signed] M. Gorbachev
General Secretary of the
CPSU Central Committee

R. Gandhi
Prime Minister of the
Republic of India

[dated] New Delhi, 27 November 1986

IZVESTIYA REPORTS GANDHI USSR EMBASSY SPEECH

PM011235 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS account of speech by Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi at dinner given by M.S. Gorbachev in his honor at the USSR Embassy in Delhi 27 November, published under the general heading "In Honor of India's Prime Minister"]

[Text] General Secretary Gorbachev, Mrs Gorbacheva!
Esteemed ministers of the Soviet Union!
Your Excellencies!
Ladies and gentlemen!

Although we signed the agreement on holding the Indian Festival in the Soviet Union and the Soviet Festival in India only today, our people have in fact already been celebrating a festival of Indo-Soviet friendship over the last 3 days.

You have seen how cordially India's people welcomed you and Mrs Raisa Gorbacheva. They consider you and Soviet people to be their friends -- cordial and reliable friends.

Our two countries are vast states with the greatest imaginable diversity of climate, language, and culture. Both our countries have made a great contribution to human civilization through the wisdom and works of our philosophers, thinkers, artists, scientists, and statesmen. Our countries have given the world two of the most eminent figures of the 20th century -- Lenin and Mahatma Gandhi.

It is good for us, and it is good for the whole world that close relations of trust and cooperation for the sake of peace have been established between us. The joint declaration which we signed this morning reflects the unbreakable determination of both our peoples to apply tireless efforts for the sake of nonviolence and peace.

Jawaharlal Nehru had a passionate desire for peace. Today we have an equally passionate desire for it. Peace was the subject of our talks these last 3 days. I attach colossal importance to this exchange of opinions. I can assure those present that every minute we spent together and every word we spoke were imbued with thoughts of how to strengthen the atmosphere of peace and friendship all over the world, how to ease tension, and how to counter militarism.

Our talks on a broad range of questions raised our bilateral relations to a qualitatively higher level. We will advance much faster in trade and economic relations, in science and technology, in the sphere of culture, and in our joint efforts for the sake of peace. We are fully determined to utilize to the full the vast potential of our mutually advantageous cooperation. We will develop cooperation by new methods. We will make sure that bureaucratic stumbling blocks and rigidity do not curb the driving force of growth. We are opening up a new chapter in our long history of cooperation, a chapter which will bring happiness and satisfaction to millions of people.

You were perfectly right in noting yesterday that there are not enough hours in the day for the work which we have to do. The billion people living in India and the Soviet Union desire peace for themselves and for the whole of mankind. All countries desire stability and the development of cooperation. Freedom from fear and poverty is a universal need.

It is a great honor and joy for us to welcome you in our land. This time your visit was almost completely taken up by talks. India's people and I impatiently await the pleasant opportunity to welcome you again and show more of India to you.

I wish you and Mrs Gorbacheva good health and success. I wish the great Soviet people peace, progress, and prosperity. May Indo-Soviet friendship flourish and serve the great cause of peace throughout the world.

GERASIMOV EVALUATES GORBACHEV INDIA VISIT

LD010949 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Nov 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Text] Hello Comrades! Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's official friendly visit to India has undoubtedly been the main event of recent days. In evaluating the results of the visit, three levesl can be determined: the practical, the diplomatic, and the philosophical.

In the practical sphere, which concerns our trade and economic relations, it is appropriate, as it is currently appropriate on many other accounts, to use the word "acceleration." The volume of Soviet-Indian trade is already inspiring. The Tver merchant Afanasiy Nikitin would have been content. And moreover, 60 percent of Indian exports to our country are industrial goods, which speaks of the successes of the country's economic development, with Soviet aid. But we also secure a stable market for Indian traditional goods, such as tea.

In the recent period difficulties have arisen in commerce in connection with the sharp fall in oil prices -- difficulties for us, since the same volume of Indian imports to our country have to be paid for with a considerably greater volume of Soviet exports to them. And in this, a considerable share falls to the cheaper oil. A sharp acceleration is now envisaged for the future. Our trade will rise by 2.5 times.

The largest agreement in the history of our relations has been signed for economic and technical cooperation -- this means a greater volume than such impressive, well-known landmarks of joint construction as Bhilai, Bokaro, Korba, Ramshai, Durgapur and Hardoi. Incidentally, all of these construction projects need modernization -- time is flying, and the equipment supplied by us is getting old. As Rajiv Gandhi said, having completed the phase of industrialization, India is passing on to the next phase, that of technical modernization. And we are giving India large credits for new construction projects. The decisions taken are very important, and the task now is to implement them. The joint statement stresses the need for the timely fulfilment of mutual obligations.

And now to the diplomatic plane of the visit. Our views of the world coincide on many matters. Our relations demonstrate to the world the possibility and the benefit of peaceful co-existence. On behalf of one fifth of mankind, our countries have addressed to the world the Delhi Declaration, based on the principles of a world free of nuclear weapons and violence. There are 10 of these principles; if they are followed, they will lead to a civilization without nuclear weapons.

The speeches of the leaders of the two countries, during their meeting in Delhi, mentioned that we must free ourselves of stereotyped solutions, that the situation demands a new philosophy in international relations, and that it is precisely in the relations between the Soviet Union and India that much of the new political thinking is manifested. Note was made of the search, common to our cultures, for the meaning of life -- of which Lev Tolstoy and Mahatma Gandhi wrote. The Delhi Declaration speaks of the priority of values common to all mankind; they are these -- life, freedom, peace, and the aspiration to happiness.

In our age of universal nuclear danger the interests of the survival of mankind must be placed higher than any others. And this is the natural approach, in the literal sense of the world "natural," because in nature -- and we, people, are a part of nature -- in nature each species strives first and foremost for self-preservation. For example, predators are sufficiently strong to kill their own kind, but they almost never do this. Predators probably have an instinctive braking mechanism aimed at the preservation of the species. Man has weak hands, but a strong head, and he has shown considerable imagination in the field of inventing instruments for the destruction of his own kind, having now reached the possibility of total self-destruction. Man has uncovered the deep secrets of inorganic nature, primarily in the context in nuclear physics. He has been confronted with the danger that this nature -- inanimate, but dangerous when liberated -- will destroy the living. And then only the inanimate will remain, because matter, as distinct from our life, does not disappear but is simply transformed.

And so, the Soviet Union and India proclaim the following in the Delhi Declaration: Mankind is worthy of a better fate than to be a hostage to nuclear horror and despair, and it possesses great resources to prevent such a catastrophe. The Delhi Declaration appeals for decisive and immediate actions for the sake of peace.

MOSCOW TV COMMENTS ON GORBACHEV VISIT TO INDIA

LD022335 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video talk by PRAVDA political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Recently I had the opportunity of unexpectedly realizing in what remarkable times we live. On Friday morning I was one of the participants in the press conference in Delhi; yet that same day, sitting at home in Moscow that evening, I watched it on television. Scientific and technological progress has reduced distances and made the world interlinked and interdependent as never before. But it has also engendered a common threat to all. The realities of the nuclear age demand a new political way of thinking, and the Delhi Declaration, which was signed as a result of the Soviet-Indian summit talks, is a model of this kind of innovative approach to the problems of peace and security.

For every people, universal peace starts on its own doorstep, so it is natural that the participants in the Delhi talks paid great attention to stability and security in Asia and in the expanses of the Indian and Pacific oceans adjoining Asia. Both participants are major Asian states and each for its own part is making efforts to unravel knots of conflict and to take away the acute nature of military confrontation in the region.

The principles of Pancasila, Bandung, and nonalignment which were mentioned in Vladivostok create, in the words of the Indian prime minister, the theoretical and political framework for analysis of the complex and distinctive problems of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific Ocean region. Rajiv Gandhi's words about the Vladivostok speech aroused widespread reaction: The influential newspaper TIMES OF INDIA prefaced it with this headline: The Prime Minister Reacts Positively to Asian Security Plan.

The thing is, until recently the Indian mass media frequently misinterpreted this idea and were inclined to give the word security a military hue, saying India wants to join some kind of Asian-Pacific Ocean pact. Public statements made during the visit leave no place for such interpretations of the term "Asian security." It was stressed that the Soviet Union does not have a ready-made recipe for solving the problems of this vast and greatly populated part of the planet, so the essence of the Vladivostok initiative is an invitation to make a joint search.

We are not talking about the mechanical transfer of the European experience onto Asian soil, but about putting into practice the principles elaborated by the peoples of Asia long before Helsinki. The formula for security for all Asia must be the fruit of joint efforts and must be acceptable to all, and I think that the visit by the Soviet leader to India has brought sufficient clarity to this issue.

DRA'S NAJIBULLAH ON RESULTS OF PDPA PLENUM

LD222000 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] Kabul November 22 TASS -- A press conference of Najib, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA), on the results of a recent plenary meeting of the PDPA Central Committee has been held in Kabul.

The Afghan leader pointed to the measures taken by the Party to broaden the social basis of the revolutionary power.

"By virtue of the fact that the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA) still remains the target of the aggression and undeclared war", Najib emphasised, "the PDPA and the country's government will continue to give unflagging attention to matters aimed at reliably protecting the borders from being penetrated by counter-revolutionary bands, will intensify work among border tribes, and will carry on the dialogue with compatriots who had been drawn through deception into subversive activities".

He said the plenary meeting, which had been held in an atmosphere of unity, principledness and businesslike efficiency, had confirmed the course towards national reconciliation, towards the solution of all issues in a peaceful political way, and towards progressive development of Afghan society.

TALYZIN RECEIVES SRV LEADER DONG SI NGUYEN

LD290055 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Talyzin today received Dong Si Nguyen, candidate member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers. During the friendly conversation, questions of mutual interest were discussed.

KURKOTKIN VISITS SRV, MEETS VAN TIEN DUNG

PM011657 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Nov 86 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report and TASS report under the general heading: "Visit to SRV"]

[Text] Marshal of the Soviet Union S.K. Kurkotkin, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services, has left on an official friendly visit to the SRV at the invitation of Army General Van Tien Dung, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee Politburo and SRV national defense minister.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S.K. Kurkotkin was seen off at the airport by the following: Admiral of the Fleet V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy and USSR deputy defense minister; Colonel General I.M. Golushko; and other Soviet generals, admirals, and officers.

The sendoff party included Major General Nguyen Don Tu, military attache at the SRV Embassy in the USSR.

Hanoi, 25 Nov (TASS) -- Marshal of the Soviet Union S.K. Kurkotkin, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services, who is on an official friendly visit here, was received by Van Tien Dung, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and SRV national defense minister.

During the meeting Army General Van Tien Dung stressed that the visit will make an important contribution to further strengthening friendship and combat solidarity and developing all-around cooperation between the USSR and SRV Armed Forces.

TASS REPORTS CHEBRIKOV ARRIVAL IN SFRY

LD021516 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1500 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Belgrade, 2 Dec (TASS) -- Viktor Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR KGB, arrived here today on an official friendly visit. He was met at Belgrade airport by Dobroslav Culafic, SFRY federal secretary for internal affairs, and by other officials. Viktor Chebrikov and those accompanying him visited the memorial complex to J. Broz Tito and laid flowers.

Soviet-Yugoslav talks, in which the delegations headed by Viktor Chebrikov and Dobroslav Culafic are taking part, started today.

TRYBUNA LUDU ATTACKS SOLIDARITY ICFTU MEMBERSHIP

PM021603 Moscow TRUD in Russian 26 Nov 86 p 3

[TASS report: "Anti-Polish Action"]

[Text] Warsaw, 25 November -- TRYBUNA LUDU publishes today an expose of the latest anti-Polish action taken by reactionary circles in the West: the admission of the disbanded "Solidarity" to the splittist trade union centers -- the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions [ICFTU] and the World Confederation of Labor [WCL].

The American labor union organ ALF-CIO NEWS, the newspaper writes, has reported the simultaneous admission of the former "Solidarity" to the two trade union associations with headquarters in Brussels. This fact merits attention from several standpoints.

It has a particularly propagandist aspect. One aim of the associations' action is to maintain at any price the impression that the former "Solidarity" continues to exist and operate, although everyone is well aware that it does not exist or operate as a trade union organization. There is a certain group of people who are engaged in political propaganda activity, supported from outside by methods which are in breach of the fundamental principles governing relations among sovereign states. It is well known that the AFL-CIO is the dominating influence in ther ICFTU. The AFL-CIO has not only supported antistate actions by the leadership of the former "Solidarity," particularly financially, but has also coordinated international action in the West aimed at using this organization to undermine Poland's state structure. The AFL-CIO's actions from this standpoint have nothing at all to do with trade union action. They have merely been a continuation of the activity of the U.S. Administration, which is manifestly interfering in Poland's internal affairs.

The admission of the former "Solidarity" into the two Brussels-based trade union associations has nothing to do with trade union activity, TRYBUNA LUDU points out.

IRANIAN ENVOY MEETS WITH OFFICIAL IN BAKU 1 DEC

LD021850 Tehran IRNA in English 1830 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Tehran, Dec. 2, IRNA -- Vice-Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and President of Azerbaijan, Suleyman Tatliyev said Monday that the Islamic Republic of Iran is now dealing fateful blows on imperialism.

Tatliyev made the remark in a meeting with Iranian ambassador to the Soviet Union Naser Nayrani-Nobari in Baku Monday where he also announced his country's willingness to further expand her relations with Iran. The Soviet official furthermore expressed hope that visit of Chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations and head of Tehran-Moscow economic delegation Konstantin Katushev to Tehran next week would create [words indistinct] the Iranian ambassador said that Iran is willing to further expand her friendly relations with its northern neighbor.

Nobari reiterated that the Islamic Republic has dealt the deadliest blows on imperialism and said that Iran will shortly end the Iraqi-imposed war victoriously in a bid to foil the biggest plot hatched by the imperialism against it.

IZVESTIYA HITS IRANIAN SUPPORT FOR AFGHAN REBELS

PM012055 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 5

[M. Kozhevnikov "International Notes": "Whose Purpose Does This Serve?"]

[Text] The events I am going to talk about occurred not so long ago in the western regions of the DRA, in Herat Province. Several dushman bands had been active there for quite some time. They terrorized the local population, murdered activists, and set fire to schools and hospitals. As a result of operations to liquidate the counterrevolutionary groups, successfully carried out by units of the Afghan Army and DRA security forces, some bandits were killed and the remainder were captured. Among the latter was a certain Abdol (Gaffur), a member of the dushman organization known as Jami'at-e Eslami. During interrogation the arrested bandit revealed that he had gone to Iran on a number of occasions to seek weapons, and that he had obtained them from persons with links to the Iranian authorities. As Abdol (Gaffur) stated, the dushmans received orders concerning upcoming "punitive actions" on the territory of Afghanistan from that same Iran.

Commenting on these facts, the BAKHTAR agency emphasized that they represent yet another confirmation of the anti-Afghan thrust of Tehran's policy and testify to Iran's participation in the undeclared war against its neighboring independent state. In rendering support to the bandits, supplying them with weapons, and siting camps for Afghan counterrevolutionaries on its own territory, the Iranian Government bears full responsibility for the bloody crimes perpetrated by the dushmans.

Other known facts also confirm that Iran is carrying out flagrant interference in the internal affairs of Democratic Afghanistan. In this year alone, the Iranian Air Force and ground forces have carried out over 60 acts of aggression against the DRA.

Despite strong protests from Afghanistan, the Iranian mass media, with Tehran's blessing, not only are not ceasing but are inflating still further the slanderous propaganda campaign against the DRA. [paragraph continues]

An active part in this campaign is also being played by various anti-Afghan press publications -- which number about 80 in Iran and Pakistan alone. As has been stated by the former chief editor of two such publications, Sayyed Mohammad Shah, who recently came over to the side of the people's power, their financing is effected by Western special services, primarily the CIA. So-called "advisers" from the U.S. espionage (agency) render assistance in preparing false materials about the "victories" of the dushmans infiltrating Afghanistan from Iran and Pakistan, and also articles distorting the progressive transformations being pursued by the DRA leadership.

Not so long ago there came to light examples of Tehran's overt interference in the internal affairs of Democratic Afghanistan -- such as the illegal crossing of the Afghan border by a group of Iranian "clergy" with the aim of assisting the counterrevolutionaries. While expatiating about their concern for Afghans who have ended up in Iran, the Iranian authorities are pursuing their forced mobilization of these Afghans into the Army for participation in military operations against Iraq and are erecting various obstacles to the return home of Afghan citizens. At the same time, Iran's ruling circles are intensifying their control over the anti-Afghan counterrevolutionary groups entrenched on Iranian territory. In particular, Tehran has made the decision that responsibility for the activities of the so-called dushman "committees" rests with Iran's Ministry of the Interior.

In Iran, there has recently been a noticeable increase in statements of an anti-Soviet nature. The pretext for this hostile campaign is provided by the USSR's principled course toward developing and strengthening the ties of friendship with the Afghan people, and toward rendering them all-round support in the work of building a new life. The Iranian ruling circles seek to denigrate Soviet policy toward the DRA and to distort the essence of the USSR's international assistance to Afghanistan. Thus, Ayatollah Montazeri, speaking on Qom at the beginning of November, made flagrant attacks on the Soviet Union and attempted to distort the intent of such an important step toward the political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan as the return home of six regiments of the limited contingent of Soviet troops which is in the DRA at the request of the Afghan Government. These statements were picked up by the Iranian mass media. It is perfectly clear that such actions do not promote the spirit of good-neighborliness between the USSR and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The question arises: What goals are the Iranian leadership pursuing by implementing such a policy? By participating in subversive activity agains the DRA, Iran has thereby aligned itself with the United States and its allies. As THE WALL STREET JOURNAL wrote the other day, John Poindexter, who until a week ago was the U.S. President's national security advisor, admitted that one of the aims of the secret operation to deliver U.S. arms to Iran was the creation of a new channel (!) "for their supply to the Afghan rebels." According to the newspaper, some of the weapons forwarded to Iran from Israel were intended for the dushmans. Specifically, the Iranians agreed to pass on the the dushmans about 100 of the 2,008 TOW antitank projectiles received from the United States.

And this is not all. The French television company Antenne-2 has reported that some of the money which Iran paid the United States for the weapons was used to assist the Nicaraguan "contras." The Iranian Government -- this company's correspondent claimed -- transferred money for the U.S. weapons directly into the "contras'" Swiss bank accounts. Tehran also transferred substantial amounts, he emphasized, to CIA accounts.

Thus, the conclusion is clear: The United States, the Israeli Zionists, and other reactionary forces benefit from the course of the present leadership of Iran, which pays lip service to its anti-imperialist goals but which in fact is aiding the forces of imperialism to wage the undeclared war against the DRA.

U.S. MANEUVERS IN HONDURAS ANOTHER 'PROVOCATION'

LD021012 Moscow TASS in English 1001 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Managua December 2 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Trushin reports:

The United States has launched another dangerous provocation against the Sandinista people's revolution: The U.S. military has started manoeuvres involving artillery in El Paraiso department in the east of Honduras. The U.S. Embassy in Tegucigalpa has had to confirm this fact. U.S. troops are being introduced into areas of El Paraiso occupied by the Somocista forces. Journalists say that their destination is the Honduran community Danli, chosen by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency as a target for a provocative attack of the contras.

The Nicaraguan Government has drawn world public attention on more than one occasion to the fact that an "attack" of Danli by the contra gangs in the guise of the Sandinista forces may be used by the Reagan administration as a pretext for a major armed action against Nicaragua.

The CIA and the Pentagon are simultaneously expanding the military training of counterrevolutionary gangs, including in the territory of the United States itself. The newspaper BARRICADA says that U.S. military advisers are training contras in terror and murder techniques in special camps in at least three states, Florida, Georgia and Texas. The extensive financing and training of the Somocistas shows that the U.S. plans for an outright act of aggression in Nicaragua are being followed in practice, BARRICADA says.

CASTRO DISCUSSES PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT, PAYMENT

LD011239 Moscow TASS in English 0618 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] Havana December 1 TASS -- Our revolution and our people take the greatest pride in the fact that we are developing as a working people, without which it is impossible to build socialism. A statement to this effect has been made by Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee, president of the Cuban Council of State and Council of Ministers. He was addressing a debate at the current special session of the third congress of the Communist Party of Cuba. He pointed to the pressing need for a further perfection of production management and the system of payment for work. Today it is one of the most important and complex tasks facing the party and the country. The Cuban leader urged the delegates to the session to pay paramount attention to the causes of blunders and shortcomings in order to rectify them.

MENTESHASHVILI REPORTS ON SUPREME SOVIET DECREES

PM020959 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

["On the Ratification of USSR Supreme Soviet Decrees. Report By T.N. Menteshashvili, Secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium" -- PRAVDA headline; report delivered at 19 November afternoon joint session of USSR Supreme Soviet chambers]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Deputies!

I am instructed to report to you on the decrees which have been adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium since the fifth session and which, in accordance with the constitution, are subject to ratification by the Supreme Soviet. There are 35 decrees in all. As you can see from the materials you have in front of you, they relate to various aspects of state, economic, and sociocultural building. The texts of the decrees have been published. I think that I need only dwell briefly, therefore, on their general features.

On 19 August a decree was published reorganizing the system of bodies managing the construction complex. The USSR State Committee for Construction Affairs became the union republic State Construction Committee as a permanent organ of the USSR Government. It is vested with extensive powers to direct the construction effort in the country. Comrade Yuriy Petrovich Batalin has been confirmed as chairman of the committee. New All-Union construction ministries for major regions have been formed on the basis of the former construction ministries. An All-Union Ministry of the Nuclear Power Industry has also been set up since the fifth session.

The relevant changes are to be made to the Law on the USSR Council of Ministers.

Also submitted for your consideration are Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees on the procedure for naming border posts for state and public figures, on the establishment of a common holiday for workers in agriculture and other sectors of the agro-industrial complex, and on additional grounds for paying insurance compensation to kolkhozes in the event of natural calamities. There is also a decree slightly modifying the procedure for exacting maintenance for underage children.

The preparation and adoption of these legislative acts is an integral part of the work carried out by the Supreme Soviet Presidium on implementing the 27th CPSU Congress decisions. In the period under review, as well as legislation, the Presidium and the chambers' standing commissions focused attention on questions of economic and social development, the conduct of the foreign policy course of the party and the state, and the strengthening of monitoring of subordinate bodies. Deputies have been given detailed information on all this.

At present soviets' efforts are geared to fulfilling the well known Central Committee resolution and the joint CPSU Central Committee and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Government resolution on increasing the role and enhancing the responsibility of soviets for accelerating socioeconomic development. We are aware that a great deal of hard work needs to be done to implement them. And the session has been right to point this out.

Comrade Deputies, as you know, during the period under review the Supreme Soviet Presidium, on the recommendation of the USSR Council of Ministers, has appointed comrades to or relieved them of government posts. The relevant decrees are also presented for your ratification.

Comrade Vladimir Mikhaylovich Kamentsev was appointed deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and at the same time relieved of the post of minister of the fish industry.

In view of his retirement on health grounds, Comrade Ivan Vasilyevich Arkhipov was relieved of the post of first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

You are also aware that Comrade Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk has been elected president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. In view of this he has been relieved of the posts of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology.

There have been some other appointments and discharges. You have been supplied with the texts of the decrees and drafts of the corresponding USSR laws and resolutions.

The Presidium expresses confidence that the Supreme Soviet will endorse these proposals. Esteemed Deputies, you are invited to consider them and adopt them. [applause]

CONTINUED COVERAGE OF RSFSR SUPREME SOVIET

Maslennikov Report

LD021412 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Excerpts] The fourth session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation opened today in the Great Kremlin Palace in Moscow. [passage omitted] Deputy Maslennikov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee delivered a report on the state plan for the economic and social development of the RSFSR for 1987 and the progress of plan fulfilment in 1986.

He noted that the first year of the 12th 5-year Plan that is coming to a close now is an important stage in the deep restructuring in all areas of the country's life. Intensive work and further improvement to management methods are already giving the first tangible results. Over 11 months the plan for marketing industrial production has been fulfilled by 101 percent. The social program is being implemented consistently. Comrade Maslennikov dwelled on the main features of the plan for 1987. He said in particular:

[Begin Maslennikov recording] The forthcoming year is crucial in the restructuring being conducted in the management system. All the republic's industry, the agro-industrial complex, transport, communications, and public services will work in new conditions of management. A radical restructuring of the economic mechanism in construction and trade will begin. Enterprises and associations are being transferred to complete financial autonomy, commercial viability and self-financing. In the plan for next year measures are envisaged which will facilitate the practical transferral to economic methods of leadership, and the overcoming of approaches stressing production volume and expenditure in planning. The use of stable economic quotas is being expanded. The quantity or indices that are approved by instruction has been reduced significantly.

All this will facilitate a growth in the independence of labor collectives.

The fundamental feature of next year is the further development of socialist self-management by the people, through enhancing the rights and responsibilities of local soviets of people's deputies in resolving matters relating to state and public life in the relevant territories. Directed at this is the well-known decision of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers, which opens up new possibilities for a more complex combination of territorial and industrial based principles in management, and makes it possible to resolve better matters relating to the everyday life of Soviet people.

One important feature of the plan for 1987 is its direction towards fulfilling the directives of the 27th Party Congress, consolidating the development of positive changes and tendencies which became manifest in 1986, and ensuring high stability in the growth of our economy. The task for next year follow integrally from the tasks of the 12th 5-year Plan and correspond to them, are distinctive for their essential intensity, and make it possible to achieve the average yearly growth rates envisaged in the 5-year plan. The national income produced and the volume of industrial production will grow by 4.3 percent, as opposed to 4 percent in the current year. It is planned to achieve the whole of the increase in the national income, without increasing the number of those employed in industries of material production, through a growth in labor productivity. [end recording]

Comrade Maslennikov went on to dwell in detail on the development of major complexes in the national economy. A basis for the accelerated development of the economy, he said, is a qualitative change for the national economy's industrial base, in which a crucial role belongs to machine-building. It is planned to increase the overall volume of output from machine-building and metal-working by 7.8 percent. A typical feature of the plan is intensifying its social orientation. In the plan all types of resources allotted to enhancing the living standards of the people are being increased, which will make it possible to speed up in comparison with the plan targets of the 5-year plan the resolving of a number of urgent social problems. The average monthly wage of blue and white collar workers, collective farmers will rise substantially. The payments and privileges form social services funds will increase. A priority rate of development is mapped out for the consumer, tourist and excursion services, physical culture and sport facilities, and financially autonomous medical treatment institutions. [passage omitted]

After the report the debates began. The session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is continuing its work.

State Plan, Budget Discussed

LD030056 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Excerpts] The RSFSR state plan for economic and social development and the republic's budget for 1987 are being discussed by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. It opened today in Moscow in the Great Kremlin Palace. [passage omitted]

As a result of implementation of the measures planned for the development of the agro-industrial complex, the volume of agricultural gross output will increase by 8.2 percent compared with 1985 and labor productivity will increase by 10.8 percent.

A broad program of social development and further raising the standard of living of the people has been drawn up. The average monthly wage for workers and personnel and labor payments for kolkhoz workers will increase, and the payments of benefits from social consumption funds will increase. Next year it is planned to build 63 million square meters of housing. [passage omitted]

Then the deputies went on to discuss the reports. The session will continue its work on 3 December.

Evening Session Ends

LD021540 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] The evening meeting at the session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has just ended in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. Drafts of the state plan for the economic and social development and the budget of the republic for the coming year were put forward for the deputies' examination. In examining the program for the further development of the republic's economy, those who spoke focused attention on new approaches to the solution of the cardinal problems of development, and spoke of the need to search for effective paths which would secure the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. Much attention was devoted by the deputies to issues connected with the utmost mobilization of reserves, and with stengthening planning production discipline. An important role in all of this, stressed those who spoke, belongs to the soviets of people's deputies, which are called upon to support everything new and actively to influence the course of restructing. The session will continue its work tomorrow. The deputies are to discuss the activity of the commissions on health, social security and sport of the PSFSR Supreme Soviet, and also to confirm the decrees of the Presidium of the supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

Law Adopted

LD031129 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 3 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 3 TASS -- Next year the national income of the Russian Federation, the largest Soviet republic, will grow by 4.3 percent.

This is provided for by law on the state economic and social development plan of the republic for 1987.

The law, adopted at the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet session which ended in the Kremlin today, envisages a further course towards the reorganisation of economic machinery and management system in industry and agriculture, the transition of enterprises to self-accounting, self-repayment and self-financing.

It is also planned to increase all types of resources being allocated for raising the living standard of the people. The population's incomes are to increase by 2.6 percent.

The aggregate amount of the expenditures of the state budget of the Russian Federation is fixed at 107,800 million roubles.

The parliament of the Russian Federation has endorsed decrees and passed appropriate laws and resolutions.

UKRAINIAN SUPREME SOVIET HOLDS SESSION 27 NOV

AU011734 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 28 Nov 86 pp 2-3

["Information Announcement on a Session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] On 27 November at 1000, the fourth session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation began its proceedings. A session of the Soviet of the Elders, held shortly before, examined the agenda and the organization of the session proceedings.

Participating in the session proceedings were V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; B.V. Kachura, A.P. Lyashko, I.A. Mozgovoy, V.A. Sologub, A.A. Titarenko, V.S. Shevchenko, Yu.A. Kolomiyets, V.A. Masol, and Ya.P. Pogrebnyak, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo members and candidate members.

Deputy P.G. Kostyuk, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet chairman, opened the session.

Following a report delivered on behalf of the Credentials Commission by its chairman, deputy P.K. Musiyenko, the Supreme Soviet unanimously resolved to recognize the credentials of deputies G.V. Dzis; V.P. Salo; V.I. Stus; and Ye.R. Chulakov, elected for Zolotonoshskiy constituency No. 610 in Cherkassy Oblast; Tatarbunarskiy constituency No. 452 in Odessa Oblast; Kagarlykskiy constituency No. 316 in Kiev Oblast; and Fastovskiy constituency No. 308 in Kiev Oblast, respectively.

The following agenda was approved:

1. The state plan for the economic and social development of the Ukrainian SSR in 1987, and the progress made in fulfilling the state plan for the economic and social development of the Ukrainian SSR in 1986.

2. The state budget of the Ukrainian SSR for 1987, and the fulfillment of the 1985 state budget of the Ukrainian SSR.

3. The tasks of the Ukrainian SSR soviets of people's deputies in implementing the decision of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers on measures to further raise the role of people's deputies and to increase the responsibility of the soviets as they accelerate socioeconomic development in light of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions.

4. The approval of the decrees passed by the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Deputy V.A. Masol, Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman and Gosplan Chairman, delivered a report on the first item on the agenda.

Deputy V.P. Kozeruk, Ukrainian minister of finance, delivered a report on second item.

The floor was then offered to deputy B.Ye. Paton, president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and to deputy V.A. Sologub, chairman of the Ukrainian Trade Union Council.

After an intermission, the chair was taken by deputy V.N. Chumachenko, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet deputy chairman. The floor was offered to deputy V.G. Malomuzh, chairman of the Planning and Budgetary Commission, to deliver a joint report on behalf of the commission.

Those participating in the discussion on the first and the second items on the agenda were deputies: N.M. Snigirev, Odessa Obkom second secretary: I.A. Kisel, steel caster at the G.I. Petrovskiy metallurgical plant in Dnepropetrovsk; V.K. Spitsyn, Donetsk Gorispolkom chairman; A.G. Blazhchuk, chairman of the Yu. Fedkovich kolkhoz in Vyzhnitskiy Rayon, Chernovtsy Oblast; V.F. Sklyarov, Ukrainian minister of power and electrification; Ye. A. Kalinina, opthamologist in the polyclinic ward of the Berdyansk children's hospital in Zaporozhye Oblast; F.I. Titarenko, general director of the Donbassantratsit anthracite mining association in Voroshilovgrad Oblast; and M.V. Grishko, Chernigov Oblispolkom chairman.

The discussion of the first and second items on the agenda continued at the afternoon session presided over by deputy I.S. Plyushch, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet deputy chairman. The speakers were the following deputies: A.I. Chernikova, plasterers and painters brigade leader under the construction administration at the South Ukrainian AES; A.N. Tkachenko, first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian State Agro-Industrial committee and Ukrainian minister; Yu. A. Beloded, electrowelders brigade leader at the Kolomyya farm machinery production association in Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast; V.G. Fedorov, Volyn Oblispolkom chairman; L.V. Mikolenko, assistant machine operator at the Gorodishche sugar refinery named after the 25th CPSU Congress in Cherkassy Oblast; V.I. Zheliba, chief of a mechanized detachment at the Dolinskiy sovkhoz in Chaplinskiy Rayon, Kherson Oblast; and Ye. M. Shcherbey, assembly worker at the Mukachevo instruments plant in Zakarpatskaya Oblast.

Deputy V.A. Masol delivered the concluding speech on the first item.

The deputies unanimously passed the law on the state plan for the economic and social development of the Ukrainian SSR in 1987. The Supreme Soviet also adopted a decision on the progress made in fulfilling the 1986 state plan for the economic and social development of the Ukrainian SSR.

Deputy V.P. Kozeruk delivered the concluding speech on the second item.

The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet unanimously passed the law on the 1987 state budget of the Ukrainian SSR, and adopted a decision approving the report on the fulfillment of the state 1985 state budget of the Ukrainian SSR.

The deputies examined the inquiry addressed by deputy L.I. Golovatenko to the Ukrainian Minister of construction on the progress made in complying with the electors' orders concerning the construction of a bakery in Feodosiya, Crimean Oblast, and listened to the reply given by minister V.P. Salo to this question. The Supreme Soviet took note of the minister's announcement that the aforeside enterprise would be built within the terms set.

D.P. Galkin, Ukrainian minister of ferrous metallurgy, replied to deputy V.N Kalish's inquiry. Having taken note of the minister's announcement, the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet pointed out in its decision that the work carried out by the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy to significantly reduce the air pollution caused by the Zaporozhye steel combine has been very poor, and obligated the minister in October 1987 to submit a report on the measures adopted.

On 28 November the fourth session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet continued its proceedings.

KUNAYEV ATTENDS KAZAKH SUPREME SOVIET SESSION

LD022342 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] A meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh SSR began today. The deputies were told about drafts of the state plan for economic and social development and the budget of the republic for 1987, about progress in fulfilling the plan for the first year of the 12th 5-year plan, and about fulfillment of the budget for 1985. Tasks connected with fulfillment of the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers on measures for further heightening the role and strengthening the responsibility of soviets of people's deputies for speeding up social and economic development in light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU congress were discussed.

Taking part in the session was Comrade Kunayev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee.

CHERKASSY OBKOM INVESTIGATES RAILROAD ACCIDENT

PM021652 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 86 First Edition p 2

[Report from "News From Party Organizations" column by TASS and PRAVDA correspondents: "Severely Punished"]

[Text] The Cherkassy Party Obkom Bureau discussed the causes of a collision between two passenger trains in the region of Koristovka station on 6 November this year. Investigation showed that the accident took place as a result of criminal negligence and the crossing of a stop signal by a locomotive team from the Taras Shevchenko depot. The leadership of the Shevchenko section of the railroad did not satisfactorily organize measures to step up traffic safety in transport. Engineer A. Galushchenko, through whose fault the accident took place, was permitted to convey passengers on insufficient grounds, after a long break from driving trains. The party committee and section leadership are restructuring their work too slowly and failing to display persistence in improving the collective's activity.

The Cherkassy Party Obkom severely reprimanded N. Pavlik, chief of the Shevchenko railroad section, with an entry on his record. He was relieved of his post. A. Rendorenko, secretary of the unit party committee, was severely reprimanded with an entry on his record, and also relieved of his post. V. Bibik, first secretary of Smela party gorkom, was reprimanded by the bureau.

A. Zhigir, chief of the Shevchenko locomotive depot, was expelled from the party and fired. V. Medvedev, secretary of the depot party committee, was severely reprimanded with an entry on his record.

NEW EDITOR ZALYGIN OUTLINES PLANS FOR NOVYY MIR

PM211231 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with NOVYY MIR Editor S.P. Zalygin by G. Melikyants, published under the rubric "Viewpoint": "Sergey Zalygin: The Reader Will Judge" -- no place or date of interview given; first paragraph is unattributed introduction]

[Text] Outstanding Soviet writer Sergey Pavlovich Zalygin recently took the helm at the journal NOVYY MIR. This conversation is about the journal's plans and some aspects of literary life.

[Melikyants] There has always been keen interest in NOVYY MIR. This interest is that much greater now, when readers expect so much from literature: How will it react to the changes taking place in life, and what stance will it take in the contemporary social process? A specific question in this context: What does the editorial board have in store for us today?

[Zalygin] Let me say this at once: I took over a well organized setup, with the next five issues of the journal already prepared. This does not mean, of course, that no restructuring at all is needed at the journal. Of course it is needed. As it is needed, incidentally, everywhere in our life.

Take for example the sections on current affairs and literary criticism (in other words, current affairs by another name, only in the literary sphere). They are far below the demands of the time and reflect inadequately the time and its problems. Even the position of literature itself in life is not completely and accurately defined. Take the Issyk-Kul forum, for example: Could this idea have been implemented even 2-3 years ago? And would it have been possible for writers to play the role they played in the spheres of the natural and cultural ecology? Did any writers' congress ever attract such public attention as the Eighth USSR Writers Congress?

[Melikyants] Incidentally, Sergey Pavlovich, a new organ -- the USSR Writers Union Secretariat Bureau -- was formed after the congress. You are a member of that bureau. Has anything been done since June, when it was established?

[Zalygin] Frankly speaking, I have yet to see the practical work for which this bureau was established. Its main task is to advance our literature and to perceive and support the leading trends of the literary process. We also have, so to speak, operational business. To influence cadre questions, for example: the various appointments and transfers and the composition of editorial boards of literary publications, because it is very important to make no mistake as to what will be entrusted to whom. We could probably produce recommendations on, for example, series publications and the issue of collected works. Finally, one of the important concerns is the improvement of copyright law and the implementation of its norms which are in force today. But the main point is to create a truly creative atmosphere within our union. In the quest for a new image of itself society makes intensive use of literature, and consequently of the Writers Union. But the union itself still remains a rather immovable organization, its image seems to have frozen and does not change sufficiently. So far, the consequences are still hardly noticeable, but give it a year or two and we will remember and start talking about omissions....

Our society is urgently seeking means to express its opinion its problems and aspirations, and where are these means to be found if not in art, if not primarily in literature? It seems to me that primarily such genres as current affairs and literary criticism must react to these new conditions and demands. [paragraph continues]

Hitherto our literary criticism has been following a convenient (from its own viewpoint) path: Some sort of slogan is promoted, like "The Writer and the Time," or "The Formation of Character," or "Inculcating Morality" for example, and then a dozen or so novels and novellas are reviewed from the viewpoint of their compliance with this slogan. I think that this is neither a scientific nor a literary method; it is pretend-criticism rather than literary criticism. Why indeed should a writer comply with a literary critic's design rather than his own? This is all the more peculiar in view of the fact that the writer's design is at times much broader than the demands made by some critics.

I also think that our literary criticism (and this also applies to NOVYY MIR) almost completely ignores the aesthetics of works of art. In other words, it speaks about subject matter, sociology, and relevance to the problems of the national economy: All this is to the point, but where is the soul of the work of art -- its aesthetics? Not a word is uttered about the soul ....

[Melikyants] Let us get back to the journal. NOVYY MIR, being a somewhat academic publication, has always striven to print major prose works, expecting them to be of value both today and in 10 years' time....

[Zalygin] We can promise the readers that our journal will remain the same. The first two issues in 1987 will launch Daniil Granin's novel "Boffin" [Zubr], which is an almost documentary work about a scientist's life and activity and his difficult fate. A novella by Leningrader Sergey Bazunov is of interest among works by modern authors. Its style is somewhat reminiscent of Sanit-Exupery. Its title is "The Seafarer" [Moreplavatel] and it is subtitled "Commentaries to an Unwritten Tale" [Kommentarii k Nenapisannomu Rasskazu]. Our prose turns more and more deeply to the global problems of life, to the macrocosm, so to speak, and we have ceased noticing the objective world of our daily life. We have a careless attitude to material things -- buy them, use them awhile throw them away.... We have no idea about the value of water or energy, and yet they are also parts of the world surrounding us.... This essay-novella was recommended to me by Academician Likhachev, who has also written a foreword to it.

I have only just finished reading a novella by Aleksandr Trifonovich Tvardovskiy, on which he worked in 1932-33 and which he himself described as unsuccessful in the sense that he did not manage to complete it. Wonderful writing. I thought that I knew Tvardovskiy well, but when I finished reading it I realized anew why he was such a brilliant poet: Because he was a brilliant prose writer! We are grateful to Mariya Illarionovna Tvardovskaya for letting us have the novella. She also prepared the text and comments on it. So, on the whole, we do have prose material for 1987. And serious material at that.

[Melikyants] You said once that the novel about today would hardly be written right now, in the present. Is this why you mistrust premature writers? Is this why you are so strict toward any haste? Nevertheless, do the journal's projects include any prose writing about contemporary events?

[Zalygin] We do, of course, cover the contemporary subject -- in Ales Adamovich's antiwar novel, in Andrey Bitov's novella which depicts an orginal human character, in a short piece by Vladimir Makanin which he has called "Losses" [Utraty] and in which the distant past is intertwined with the present, and in new works promised to the journal by Ch. Aytmatov, V. Astafyev, V. Belov, and V. Rasputin. As for current affairs, for the time being I have undertaken the performance of this task personally: The first issue will carry an article written by me on ecological problems.

The poetry section projects are yet to be finalized....

[Melikyants] It is interesting that, apart from your immediate predecessor Vladimir Karpov, all of the journal's editors have been poets -- Simonov (even though he did write novels and novellas), Tvardovskiy, Narovchatov. And now prose writers are again becoming editors....

[Zalygin] Tvardovskiy, I recall, had a passion for publishing poetry, and he made his own demands of it. I think that a prose writer will not lower the standards regarding poetry....

[Melikyants] And how about articles on the arts? About screen and stage presentations, for example. In other words, about the life of literature in other branches of the arts. Does the journal intend to enter this sphere?

[Zalygin] We dream about it. The journal must perform not only a cultural and educational function, but also a literary and world-philosophical one. We must talk about world philosophy through literature or of literature in the light of world philosophy, of the philosophical problems of our time. Not in an abstract fashion, but through the practical work of writers.

[Melikyants] It was said at the conference of social science department heads that it is necessary to score major intellectual victories and advance substantially in the interpretation of the new phenomena and processes in life.

[Zalygin] This is absolutely mandatory as regards literature too. It is particularly necessary to clarify what is to be considered a discovery in literature and art and what is merely going around in circles. Take, for example, the aesthetics of Soviet prose from the sixties and seventies: The time has come to sum up the results of this period in the development of our literature. Where does it differ aesthetically from the prose of, say, the fifties or the postwar years? How great is our loss when we lose aesthetic criteria! And how great is the resulting gain by the notorious "gray" literature which is produced not only by inexperienced writers but also by writers who are, in some way, highly experienced....

And how important it is for us to look at what is happening in our theater and cinematography! For what must be 10-15 years now in many cases our theater has managed without playwrights, even though playwrights are now engaged in quite active work. A new trend has emerged -- stage prose -- in which directors bypass the playwright and translate prose into the language of the theater for themselves and for their group. And yet we have never seen a play translated into prose. Here we have a one-way movement. But a very interesting movement.

[Melikyants] The following was also emphasized at the conference: Whenever the spiritual impulse is enfeebled in man and socity, there is an inevitable intensification of consumerist attitudes and acquisitiveness, and the inner world becomes poorer. Do the editorial board's projects include works with a meaning in tune with the moral problems of our life?

[Zalygin] A genuine work always performs this actual moral task. I think that this is primarily a matter of current affairs. I want to draw attention to a piece by teacher Irina Chervakova. Her work has never been printed. Absorbed by the problems of bringing up children and adolescents, she left Moscow for Krasnoyarsk Kray, where she worked for several years in a school for children whose life had gone wrong, so to speak. Her piece goes far beyond the framework of this school and these children; it is about our spiritual life. [paragraph continues]

This is a really good item. But how does a good item differ from a bad one? A bad item is nothing but padding.

And what is inspiration, what is creative impulse? Ultimately, it is speed of thinking, urgency of thought, concentration, and conciseness. When this concentration is lacking in a work, it is not a work of art even though it uses the right words, covers topical problems, and everything is done "properly."

[Melikyants] Do you think that NOVYY MIR has its own readers? What are they like?

[Zalygin] I think that our reader is primarily a serious person, interested in the complex problems of life and art. We are read by people who love to read. Regardless of whether they are workers, engineers, physicians, or scientists. They cannot be put off by the difficulties and complexities of reading. One the contrary, they are keen to overcome the difficulties of perception, they want to ponder together with the author, agreeing or disagreeing with him.

Here is a letter from yesterday's mailbag. Written by a miner. One can sense that he is no professional, but he is perfectly clearly aware of literature's social role. Intelligence in our country depends not on a person's origins but on his education and self-education. Various specialized vocations have their professional journals. Ours is a literary-artistic and sociopolitical journal.

[Melikyants] There is still a group of readers who demand a special -- what shall we say -- approach, special subjects and heroes. These are the young people.

[Zalygin] I am convinced that all the problems perturbing the so-called mature readers perturb young people equally as much. At times they draw from our works conclusions which are far more profound than those drawn even by people from the older generation. They are not tired of contacts, they are not tired of their own experience: They have only just started seeking it. But how nice it would be if a young writer would write about young people! So far we have not seen such a work.

[Melikyants] The personality of a literary journal's editor probably leaves its imprint. Would you like to have your "own" journal -- your own in the sense of using it to pursue your own line in literature, to uphold that line which you perceive as your party and social duty and which is, at the same time, a personal line, developed over many years?

[Zalygin] Our literature is voluminous and diverse, that is true. But it is not enough — our literature must also be new. Primarily, of course, in the sense of contemporary subjects and problems. Take the subject of science for example -- what an enormous and contradictory importance it has acquired now! This must be written about, it must perceived. If this perception demands new literary forms, this means that such forms must be sought and created. Any new form must be really necessary -- and then it is justified.

I personally have a passion for books about science, about scientists, but science fiction leaves me cold, as do thrillers. The main question for me is: How do tradition and classicism exist and evolve in modern literature? I am convinced that there can be no culture without traditions.

[Melikyants] NOVYY MIR has published foreign authors, although not often. What will be the situation now?

[Zalygin] We are preparing works by Boell and Kesey, and we would like to publish something from the modern Hungarian literature: They have some very good prose writing.

[Melikyants] And what would you say about writers from the fraternal republics?

[Zalygin] We are an All-Union journal and, therefore, we cannot miss out any part of the entire Soviet literature. NOVYY MIR has published Bykov, Aytmatov, Chiladze, Gonchar, Matevosyan... But here we have the following finer point. I have already had telephone calls from one republic: It has been a long time, I was told, since anyone of ours was published?! But we do not publish republican representatives, we publish works which have become a solid fact of the multinational Soviet literature. We will seek these solid items.

[Melikyants] How do you see NOVYY MIR among the other journals of its kind?

[Zalygin] Here it is all down to the authors -- who approaches which journal. We will not be able to talk about results before at least the end of next year. During this period many journals will publish new items, and the reader will judge what is interesting.

[Melikyants] And what is Zalygin the writer working on now?

[Zalygin] Zalygin the writer is working on the journal NOVYY MIR.

[Melikyants] Even so, what are your plans?

[Zalygin] Now I am basically working on current affairs; I have written more than 20 articles in 1 year. There are also two new short stories -- satires. I am not writing a novel; I have put that off....

VACCINATION CARRIED OUT AGAINST A-1 FLU VIRUS

LD021138 Moscow TASS in English 1105 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS -- As a result of mass vaccination of the population we have had lately no such devastating flu epidemics as in the past and, I am sure, are not going to have them ever again, Mikhail Narkevich, deputy chief of the General Quarantinable Infections Board, the Health Ministry of the USSR, said in an interview with a correspondent of the newspaper TRUD.

But flu cases do occur, he said. A variety of flu virus, A-1 type, was brought to the Soviet Union from the southern hemisphere towards the end of spring, but it became active only now when suitable conditions appeared for this. This agent is well known to Soviet doctors. It was ravaging the country in 1947-57. This means that those above thirty have sufficiently effective immune defences against it. They do not contract the disease or have a milder form of it. Moreover, we had completed the vaccination of over 50 million people before the flu onset.

In the campaign against flu district doctors are being helped by more narrow specialists, staff members of research medical institutions and senior students of medical colleges, Mikhail Narkevich said. Additional transportation facilities have been provided for the visiting doctor service, drug stores put on a round-the-clock schedule and, wherever necessary, certain institutions placed under quarantine.

VOROTNIKOV ATTENDS MEETING OF KOLKHOZ COUNCILS

LD300017 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 29 Nov 86

[Text] The All-Russian meeting of the representatives of the kolkhoz councils from the autonomous republics, krays and oblasts: On the dais are Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; Murakhovskiy, first deputy of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee; Skiba, first deputy chief of agriculture and food industry department of the CPSU Central Committee; leaders of a number of ministries and departments; front-ranking workers of production; and winners of socialist competiton. The report on the tasks of the kolkhozes to raise the output of agricultural production by intensively applying technology and improving the management methods was delivered by Yermin, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Agro-Industrial Committee. A measure was adopted that envisages concrete measures to eliminate shortcomings. New members were also elected to the All-Russian kolkhozes' council as well as delegates for the All-Union meeting of the representatives of kolkhozes' councils.

Murakhovskiy, Nikonov Speak

LD020016 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 1 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by V. Golubev over video]

[Excerpts] An All-Union meeting of representatives of kolkhoz councils of the union republics was held today in the Hall of Columns of the House of the Union in Moscow today. Our country has more than 26,000 kolkhozes which produce almost half of the gross agricultural produce.

The rapporteur, Comrade Murakhovskiy, chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom, pointed out that matters in the agro-industrial complex are turning out for the better. This year the harvest of grain crops, potatoes and vegetables is increasing. Animal husbandry produce has risen by 5 - 7 percent. These are undoubtedly the first results of restructuring. Unfortunately, however, this work is still proceeding slowly. Many kolkhozes are not fulfilling plans and are acting weakly in introducing financial autonomy and collective contracting. There is a great deal of dependence, with farms living off credits. More than 2,000 kolkhozes will end, in fact, with losses. Not everything is well with the agro-industrial complex, either. [passage omitted]

Restructuring opens many paths for rapid movement forward. But this is not only feared but is renounced because of [word indistinct]. This was referred to by Comrade Nikonov in his speech. A new composition of the All-Union Council of Kolkhozes was elected at the meeting.

LAUNCH OF COSMOS-1803 EARTH SATELLITE REPORTED

LD021423 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS -- The Soviet Union today launched an artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1803, next in the series.

The satellite is fitted out with scientific equipment designated for continued exploration of outer space.

The satellite was put into an orbit with the following parameters:
-- Initial period of revolution is 116 minutes,
-- Maximum distance from the surface of the earth (apogee) is 1,502 kilometres,
-- Inclination of the orbit is 82.6 degrees,

Apart from scientific instruments, the satellite carries on board a radiosystem for precise measurement of the orbit's elements and a radiotelemetric system to transmit to the earth data on the operation of instruments and scientific equipment.

The equipment installed in the satellite operates normally.

The coordination and computer centre processes the incoming information.

MARCHUK INTERVIEWED ON NEW SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS

LD270307 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; L. Savitskiy video report]

[Text] A traveling session of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium began work in Vladivostok today. This is the first time that a forum of scientists of such high rank is being held in Vladivostok. Taking part in it are the leadership and members of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, academicians and secretaries of its departments, presidents of the academies of union republics, and leaders of scientific centers of ministries and departments. [video shows rostrum with statue of Lenin behind it; shown seated are Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, K.V. Frolov, and "G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences"]

[Marchuk] Well, you know when Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was in the Far East and spoke in Vladivostok, he set a task of raising the necessary potential and the importance of this kray in the socioeconomic development of our country. Naturally this sets a task for scientists. Today we will be discussing the question of preparing for the establishment of a Far East Scientific Center of the USSR Academy of Sciences, with approximately the same structure as the Siberian Department. After that we will then be looking at the question of setting up and establishing a Urals Scientific Center of the academy, or a Urals Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences. This has great prospects for the Department of the Far East Region, the Urals Region, and for the RSFSR as a whole, insofar as these three departments will be serving the most dynamic oblasts and regions of the Russian Federation in the east of our country.

MOSCOW MEETING MARKS MISSILE TROOPS DAY

PM301535 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Nov 86 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Ceremonial Meeting in Moscow"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting of representatives of the hero-city of Moscow's working people and servicemen from the capital's garrison to mark Missile Troops and Artillery Day was held 19 November in the Central Academy Theater of the Soviet Army.

The meeting's presidium included: Yu.D. Maslyukov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; USSR ministers O.D. Baklanov and P.V. Finogenov; F.A. Tabeyev, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; Army General P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General Yu.P. Maksimov, USSR deputy defense minister; I.A. Larin, first deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee Section; N.A. Shakhov, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee Section; Lieutenant General V.S. Nechayev, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; and also Chief Marshal of Artillery V.F. Tolubko, marshals of various categories of troops, generals, admirals, officers, missile troops and artillery veterans, defense industry workers, and designers.

The ceremonial meeting was opened by A.I. Kostenko, deputy chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom.

The missile troops and artillerymen were cordially welcomed by V.I. Sokolov, leader of a team of mechanics from the Sokolnicheskiy Freight Car Repair Plant, V.L. Lapygin, Hero of Socialist Labor and doctor of technical sciences, and I.N. Nikitin, secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee.

The meeting was addressed by Army General Yu.P. Maksimov, commander of the Strategic Missile Forces and USSR deputy defense minister.

LEADER AT COMMEMORATION OF MSU ZHUKOV'S BIRTH

LD011620 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1521 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow, 1 Dec (TASS) -- The name of Marshal of the Soviet Union Georgiy Konstantinovich Zhukov is widely known in the USSR. An eminent commander, a true son of the party and the people, he embodies the Soviet school of military art. This was spoken of at an evening which took place here dedicated to the 90th anniversary of the birth of Marshal of the Soviet Union Georgiy Zhukov.

In the presidium were Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, first deputy USSR Minister of defense; Army General Petr Lushev, first deputy USSR minister of defense; Admiral Aleksey Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy; generals, admirals, and officers and the representatives of party, state, and public organizations. In a report by Army General Ivan Tretyak, deputy USSR minister of defense and in speeches, it was noted that the commanding talent of Georgiy Konstantinovich Zhukov was particularly clearly revealed in the bitter years of the Great Patriotic War. The Communist Party and the high command directed him toward the most difficult sections of the struggle with the fascist aggressors. The services of the military leader were highly celebrated by the party and state: he was distinguished with the title of Hero of the Soviet Union four times. His life is a remarkable example of selfless service to the socialist motherland.